

THE

CHURCH REVIEW.

VOL. XL

APRIL, 1858.

No. 1.

ART. I.—MR. DICKINSON'S LETTER.*

———, FEBRUARY, 1858.

MY DEAR SIR:—I had intended, when I wrote to you in August, merely to add a few notes to the pamphlet I had sent you, thinking that perhaps you might make use of it, and of them, in your Review. Various circumstances have prevented my writing again till now, and the hindrances are by no means diminished by finding that you take my suggestion for far more than it was worth. I had intended just to notice a few points which are not at first sight intelligible to persons educated in a different state of things from ours.

You speak of information on the Church movement here. To give this properly, is beyond my strength; to say what share the different parties here have had in our movement, what is due to our Church Establishment and to ancient

* In reply to our own request to a distinguished English layman for definite information on the late attempts to revive Convocation, and the present actual working of the English Church System, we have the following Letter, which we prefer to give in its original form. We hope it will be read in connection with a subsequent Article in our present Number of the Review, in reply to the late work of Dr. Pusey.

ED. CH. REV.

fixed customs, and what to the action of the Voluntary Principle, and lastly, to guess at what is coming, is much more than I can pretend to perform.

It would be a great mistake to suppose, that because our Bishops, some five years back, sanctioned a measure for the Colonial Church, which did not differ in any important principle from your Constitution, and because Synods framed as was then proposed, have been established, or are in process of formation, in all the more important Colonies, that therefore we shall at once have the like here. The cause which has kept alive Convocation, forbids it, our national love of precedent, and adherence to tradition.

Your readers have heard of Convocation only of late, but I hardly need tell them that it has always met at the beginning of each Parliament, that not merely the ancient customs have been observed by those officers of the Crown whose duty it is to issue the proper forms for summoning a new Parliament—this is intelligible, because a nation, at least of our race, is always zealous of its rights, even in their minutest parts—but that the peculiar vestments should have been maintained in which the Bishops appear and that in the Address that is always presented to the Crown—the only business which has occupied Convocation for many ages—the rights of the Lower House to amend, should have been respected; the Bishops who framed the Address, being in the habit of leaving out some word, or putting some unimportant word wrong, in order that the vigilance of the Prolocutor and his fellows might prompt the amendment, which they have the right to propose; and that the Convocation of Canterbury, at least, should have always been prorogued from time to time during the Session of Parliament, as it pleased the Archbishop, and when Parliament itself was prorogued from time to time, that the Archbishop, or his officer, prorogued Convocation invariably to the day after the one mentioned by the Queen's Commissioners; this almost puerile adhesion to forms—for which, as English Churchmen, it is our duty to be deeply thankful,—forbids any sudden changes. Forms have preserved our institutions: is it wonderful that the conservative feeling among us—a feeling stronger, perhaps, among the dignified Clergy, than in any other class—adheres to them, and will refuse to sanction changes which you or I may think salutary, unless they come with a claim of necessity which cannot be doubted?

It is now, I think, sixteen years since the Lower House, under its late Prolocutor, the Dean of Ely, first broke the

ice, and resolved on a substantial amendment to the Address, which had been prepared, I believe, for the Upper House by the late Bishop of London. The amendment was to omit so much of it as sanctioned the changes then recently made by act of Parliament alone, in the Cathedrals. The Upper House appeared surprised, when the Dean, after mentioning the usual verbal alteration, proposed this, took a quarter of an hour to consider, and then agreed to the alteration.

I doubt not that short debates had occurred in former Parliaments—in the Lower House, especially—but reporters were not present in either, and the debates had no results. Now, however, when Convocation debates as much as it pleases, and freely makes its suggestions, such beginnings look small, and the policy by which it has advanced with so much success, timid and mean. But it is nevertheless but justice to acknowledge, that to the singular moderation of both Houses, and the very slow progress they have been wisely content to make, its establishment as a revived institution of the country, in the face of deep-rooted national prejudice, is mainly owing.

Though of late the Revival of Convocation has on the whole been supported by the High Church party, and resisted by their opponents, this has not always been the case. The late Mr. Kempthorne, a friend, and, I believe, chaplain of Bishop Ryder, of Gloucester, published a pamphlet recommending its revival, and the same thing was advocated at one time by the late Mr. Alexander Gordon, and others, leaders of the same party. The practical advantages of deliberative and legislative assemblies are obvious, and are independent of party. Those may call for Synods at one time who fear their censure at another. There is something austere and awful about the mediæval character and forms of Convocation; its schedules of absent members, pronounced contumacious, and reserved for the pleasure of Reverendissimus at the next session, when they are again to be wrapped up and reserved over and over again till Parliament is dissolved; such swelling words as these, and the no less bold claims and assertions of right made by the less cautious members, even though they may be baseless or impossible, are anything but reassuring to a party which never knows its own strength, and has a curious faculty of putting itself in a corner, and believing that it is persecuted. It is no wonder, therefore, that that party has recently opposed Convocation, and expressed alarm at its progress.

But it would be a mistake to consider the Convocation

movement apart from our general Church progress during the last half century, for the whole has been very closely connected together with you, as well as with us, and in the Colonies, we owe much to the Oxford movement, which began twenty five years ago. It may well teach us faith, to observe how much good and strength has come to the Church generally from the heavy blow and discouragement Lord Derby then gave to the Irish Church. It is commonly said that the Oxford movement has failed utterly. There cannot be a greater mistake. That it has disappointed the hopes of its earliest leaders, may be true enough, as well as that some of its chiefs have gone to Rome, and some have left the High Church party, and that it is broken up and has now no recognized leaders. I believe it to have all the more power, because its members are thinking for themselves, and acting independently. If some are quietly laying aside expectations and views which they find to be extravagant, others are carrying them out with a keenness which human nature will not bear. We must not suppose that the burning words of Froude and Wilberforce against Erastianism are producing no effect, nor that the marvelous growth of our Episcopate and yours, and the restoration of Episcopal election in our Colonial Church, are all the fruits of the Oxford movement. The Low Church party, and Rome, have both received men and ideas, which must make them very different from what they have been. The leaven is still spreading—we have seen but the beginning of the improvement of old things. It needs but little policy, nothing but charity and moderation, if God grant us these graces, to guide our own counsels, and unite our parties, in accordance with the true principles of our Church. But I fear that Rome will have a much more difficult task with the fragments of the party which she has received, but not assimilated. The two main results, up to the present time, appear to be a vast increase of arrogance in the court of Rome, and a great estrangement and mutual dislike between the new converts and the old Roman Catholics. With the new development of religious Newspapers and Reviews, the Church of Rome is under popular control in a new way, which it may be its rulers do not understand. And while they are estranging the people of Germany and France by the removal of the old method of popular control, it may be that they are enslaving themselves to a new power in all those countries where opinions can be more freely expressed. Under these circumstances, though one can expect no acknowledgment of erroneous policy, there may be at any time any

amount of change. I can imagine concessions to our Communion, greater than would have satisfied Queen Elizabeth, Laud or Wake. Such things have even been whispered about of late, but I have little doubt that if proposed now, they will come too late, for our Communion, thank God, is not what it was in those days.

But I must not wander into the future of the Church of Rome, whose probable divisions and troubles I may anticipate, but cannot prove. I have to do with our own party and its progress. Many of the Tractarians, and notably the Wilberforce family, and those who can trace their impressions of good to the late Mr. J. Sargent, the biographer of H. Martyn, and his friends, belonged to the Low Church party here. And to the early training which the best of that party gave their children, they can trace their subsequent progress. We have had, too, our Church Building movement, whose growth was anterior to the Tractarian movement—four or five thousand Churches built or rebuilt within a few years—a movement such as Bunsen is said to have declared, has produced more Churches in our country than have been built in all Europe besides, since the Reformation—an exaggeration, I believe, and which, to your readers, will give a very exaggerated idea of our progress towards the voluntary system, because our attempts to endow the Churches by voluntary subscriptions have been on the whole inefficient, but which yet is very remarkable.

Here, again, though the Church Building movement is a good deal under High Church management, and there are connections between that party and the rulers of the Church, as well as with antiquarianistic architecture and art, which are natural, and give a bias to the whole, yet the share of the Low Church party must not be forgotten. They had more to do with the first irregular movement in the right direction, the establishment of proprietary chapels in our neglected towns, than with the more systematic attempts since. And when the Church Building movement was taking a turn little to their taste, they established the Pastoral Aid Society, the first great voluntary effort for evangelizing our dense populations, and have always supported it with more energy than its High Church rival.

I ought not also to forget to mention that from the peculiar social position of the Church of England and its places of education, we are continually receiving members and ministers from the dissenting bodies. Not only do dissenters join the Church where the preaching is to their

taste, and so sojourners among us become permanent inhabitants, but as men rise in social position, they are tempted to leave off their peculiarities and join the Church. Many of their ministers have been ordained, others have left their ministry and followed the law, ultimately adopting the position of Church laymen, and above all, the sons of these are frequently brought up for Holy Orders. Nor can I make out that, on the whole, the result is such as to cause us any alarm. For if there are one or two, whose orthodoxy is not clear, there are many whose Churchmanship is most decided, and there can be no doubt which is most influential, the public statements of the latter, or the concealed opinions of the former. We have had thus a great accession of strength and energy from among the dissenters, and the effect is probably greater than it would be among you, for causes which I shall have to mention more at length presently; certain tendencies, I mean of our cathedral system, which needs the voluntary system as it exists among our dissenters and you, to enliven it.

Our Church, then, during the last half century, has received additions of strength from very various quarters, and has been stimulated by heavy blows and great discouragements from the State. It would be a very grievous mistake to suppose that religious antiquarianism, or any other development of mere scholarship, can revive the Church. These advantages can only act as a basis of practical holiness and religious feeling. When these virtues are not absent, the consciousness of the Church in other regions, and at other times, may well strengthen faith, and make hope clearer, because the continuity of the Church and its spread over divers countries, and its increasing strength, show us that the promises of Divine help are ours, and we may well hope that if we use our advantages, and never put our confidence in them, we shall improve still further.

But I must refer more particularly to the progress of Convocation, and my reasons for writing to you. It has been agreed all along, by all who have given their attention to the subject, that neither the Constitution of Convocation, nor its relations to the State, were such as could be permanent. In a subject so new and so little understood, it is not strange that opinions should be very much divided on the reasons for change, and still more on the measures to be adopted. The clergy have generally clung to Convocation with extreme tenacity, not seeing—what, I suppose, will be obvious, to a people who, like you, have made your own Ecclesiastical Assemblies—that any meeting called together in an orderly way, by

lawful authority, which comprises the Episcopate and the representatives of the Clergy, and secures liberty of speech and vote to both, is as good as any other; since its decisions must rest on the authority of the Apostolical Succession, and the consent of the Bishops and Clergy. Now, inasmuch as Convocation is provincial, and not national, and very inadequately represents the Clergy, it is possible to conceive a much better Assembly. But the English Clergy seem generally unable to appreciate this argument. They desire not merely that any new Assembly should be created by Convocation—which may be very highly expedient, but is not necessary—but further, that any new Assembly should be Convocation itself reformed, and they are generally unwilling that Parliament should have any hand in that reform. Hence, the plans of reform have been dwarfed and maimed, in order that they might be such, as it was supposed that Convocation or the Bishops or the Archbishops or the Crown, could create by their own authority. But it has been the uniform course of English precedents during the last one hundred and fifty years, to limit the prerogative and to throw doubt on the powers of the Crown, or any other body, to make changes, or to do anything extraordinary, except where the safety of the realm was concerned. Herein you will see that we are practically adopting republican principles, since the policy throws us back in all things more and more on the House of Commons, and yet I see no misgivings, even among our strongest conservatives, as to the safety of the course we are pursuing.

The more I have thought of it, therefore, the more have I doubted as to the possibility of the reforms of Convocation, which were proposed, being effected without the assent of Parliament: and yet the objections to reforming Convocation by Parliament, seemed fatal.

The principle which ruled when Charles the 2d's Act of Uniformity was enacted, was, that laws made by the Church should be ratified by the State. That principle, which of course it is desirable to maintain, has been departed from of late years, for the Bishops, whenever they wanted legislation for the Church, have gone to Parliament at once, and asked for a measure. When, as in the case of the Act which enabled us to give you the Succession, the Bishops' party spoke the voice of the Church, I see no reason to object; but from Elizabeth's Act of Uniformity, to the Divorce Act of last year, there have been continually measures affecting the Church, which have passed through Parliament against the will of the whole, or nearly the whole Episcopate.

Some of these measures were outrages on the Church, and examples of the enslaving it by the civil power—which you will bear in mind, that no Church Constitution can ever keep us altogether free from—some, we may now look on as salutary; and some, probably, were always right, such as the limitations of non-residence and plurality of livings, which the House of Commons insisted on, some twenty years back, to a larger extent than the heads of the Church desired.

Still, with the remembrance that Parliament has not always kept within reasonable bounds, it is not wonderful that the Clergy shrink from leaving the reform of Convocation to it; and those of them who are less bold, and therefore the least prepared to make the changes which the times demand, will of course object the most.

But I have endeavored to point out in my pamphlet, other and better reasons. There is a kind of elasticity about the common law, and our ancient legislation, which does not apply to new statutes. We have not fully explored, yet, the functions of Convocation, nor can we tell to what extent we may not develop them. If we take a new Act of Parliament, instead of the prescription and precedents of five hundred years, we must take the present state of things, and no more, with the danger of Parliament imposing some restrictions, and perhaps leaving some necessary point uncovered; so that our Synods, when exercising their powers under the new Act, may find something left out by mistake, which it may be impolitic to ask an unwilling Parliament to supply. These difficulties, the time and trouble necessary to reform the different Convocations, and then unite them into one, the constitutional embarrassments which their connection with Parliament would create, and then, after all, the impossibility of retracing our steps, if the measure did not answer, and obtaining Convocation again after it had been altered, and in being altered, abolished, so far as it was the real old established institution, made me clear that it was unwise to attempt to reform Convocation at all, and that we ought rather to leave it alone, to act as a provincial body, to such an extent, and in such way, as the Bishops and Clergy should think fit; and to create a new Assembly for England, similar to your General Convention, which also should do such business as might be found desirable.

I have no doubt that if the two assemblies coexisted, the latter would have the predominant power, and the former become, as they have been for the past one hundred and fifty years, mere forms. We are too business like here to keep in

constant action two sets of assemblies, merely to preserve symmetry. And I have had as little doubt, for some years past, that we should soon obtain by one way or another a Synod like yours. No one can see how the principle of Synodical action has spread from one collective Episcopate to the Colonies,* and consider their importance and influence, and the peculiar and very English mode in which it has taken root in Victoria and Canada, by the joint action of Church and State, without feeling sure that its adoption at home is merely a question of time.

While, therefore, one watched with intense anxiety what was going on, it seemed needless to say anything.

There were circumstances, however, in the early part of last year, which made me think it time to speak out. The warm reception given the year before to the principle of Mr. Seymour's motion, about the admission of the laity, seemed to give a new

* Your readers may have noticed the various abortive attempts to legislate in the English Parliament for the Church in the Colonies. The most remarkable measure of the whole series was the bill of the Archbishop of Canterbury in 1853. It was prepared by the Bishop of Oxford, and submitted to various meetings of the Bishops, and at last presented to the House of Lords by the Archbishop as their organ, no important difference of opinion having, I believe, occurred among their Lordships, though, of course, the manifold difficulties of the subject must have been extremely embarrassing. The bill was introduced late in the session, when it was well nigh impossible that it could pass, and, if I remember right, the debates gave no promise of success even for the year following. Indeed the task was an impossible one. If the measure proposed was a simple one, the Colonies might fairly say, What do you want us to do? give us the details! If the details were given, the cry would be, How can the Imperial Parliament presume to interfere, without the slightest necessity, in a quantity of small local matters, which common sense, as well as recent compact, leaves altogether to the Colonial Parliaments? There must be some concealed reason for so strange a course. England wishes to impose on us an established Church contrary to all our desires. There was besides a most embarrassing conflict of legal opinions as to the need of such an act, and the power of the Colonial Church to make its own laws independently, turning on the very difficult questions of the power of the Crown over religion in the Colonies, and the scope of ancient English acts of Parliament which have limited and restrained the clergy, whether in fact they were local or personal. I have never myself felt any impatience at either class of objections, because it was plain that our Parliament ought to see its way through the fog before it moved. But what legislation could not do, the moral effect of that seemingly abortive bill of the English Bishops performed. Before the end of 1854, the Bishop of Melbourne had called together his clergy and laity, and obtained their assent to a measure, framed on the basis of the Archbishop's bill, by the Colonial law officers of the Crown, and had carried it through the Parliament of Victoria. Evading thus the whole of the difficulties which depend on the civil relations of the Colonies to us, and our different views of the relations of Church and State, the Bishop had to meet the constitutional difficulties alone, and after a year's delay, the Queen was advised to give her assent. Since then a similar measure has been prepared by my good friend Mr. Cameron of Toronto, but it was judged better by the Bishop to proceed with a shorter and less elaborate act, which has, also, after long delays, received the Royal assent.

impetus to the movement, while the difficulties of detail seemed to preclude Convocation from dealing with it. Here, then, was an opening for my own view. But besides this, I thought I saw tendencies in the new Convocation to press forward reform, irrespective of the difficulties of the case, and from the quarter in which I observed those tendencies I was by no means sure that they might not indicate a disposition in the Low Church party or the Government to take up the question and decide it.

For myself, I am so sure of the salutary effect of such a Church Constitution as yours, and of its wholesome tendencies to allay party feeling and bring the Clergy and Laity into harmony, that I would accept it from any quarter, and trust to its inherent power, as of the collective Bishops, Clergy and Laity justifying the innovation, and would heartily support a government in which I have no great confidence, and a party to which I do not belong, in carrying it. But such would not be the general feeling of the High Church party, many of the members of which have an unreasonable dislike of your Church and its institutions, and to whom the action of the laity is altogether a novelty. I thought, therefore, that the time had arrived for speaking out, so as to be beforehand with a definite plan, and to point out some of the difficulties of the only other course which up to that time had been before us.

The Report, also, of Dr. Wordsworth's Committee, on the reform of Convocation, was altogether beneath the occasion. The reference was large enough to enable them to take up the whole question in a business like way, but the Chairman tied them down to the very narrowest view of the question. The Committee, certainly, by the last words of their Report, set the stone rolling sufficiently to carry it speedily beyond their power, but abstained from anything that might direct it. Where there is not apathy in Church questions among the English laity, there is very generally an uneasy feeling. I am afraid, therefore, that assemblies of Church wardens, chiefly of the agricultural class, would either say nothing or say something unpleasant, while it is probable that the delegates from these same assemblies of Church wardens, if they could meet with those of the Clergy in a national assembly, would agree with the Clergy better, and exhibit that better knowledge and better feeling which representatives may be expected to possess over those who have elected them.

I should, therefore, think a National Assembly better and

safer than local assemblies, even besides the immense advantage it possesses in bringing opinions to the test of votes, over the desultory action of a multitude of small assemblies, of very different opinions and personal weight. It was just this action which Canon Wordsworth's Report set in motion. It was to be feared that if the working of it proved as unsatisfactory as I thought I had reason to expect, the whole question of Synodical action would suffer in consequence, and therefore I was the more disposed to propound a plan which seemed to me easier and safer than any of the plans for reforming Convocation, or establishing new assemblies, that I had heard proposed.

I will just remark before leaving this part of my subject, that Diocesan Synods like yours would doubtless be the complement of our system of Church Assemblies, but that I doubt the safety in the present state of the English Church, of beginning even with them.

But I must proceed to make some remarks, more especially relating to views advanced in my own pamphlet, and to things which may be misconceived in it. And first, I must mention that I have argued as with Englishmen on the basis of the present state of things existing among us. It seemed to me idle to take as a basis a state of things which does not exist, and is not likely to exist, and to indulge day dreams of improvement through it, while the ground was really slipping away under our feet, and things going from bad to worse. I saw no reason to conceal the fact that our present state was bad, and I think I have given reasons for my argument that if we establish an Assembly similar to your General Convention, our condition will improve. I have not however taken any occasion to censure our state of things, that were not necessary in my argument, or to attempt to give any view of the general relations which I might think ought to subsist between Church and State. Your commonly received theory is, that the Church should be free from the State, and those who hold it may well ask me with something of triumph, what are the relations between Church and State which you approve of? To this, I would answer, that I think our State in many respects far from what is right, and that I wish to improve it, but that I cannot lay down any general principles which shall be universally applicable to the relations of Church and State; that I do not believe in any but very small and insignificant denominations being permanently free; and that between those two great natural limits, that it is not the function of the State to dictate in spiritual matters, nor of the Church to dictate in secular mat-

ters; much must always be left to mutual forbearance, and many different standing grounds may be taken, and may be tolerable. In receiving the Queen's Supremacy, we acknowledge that the general external coercive power of the State is supreme. I conceive that you acknowledged the same thing by the action of the Convention of New York and the General Convention in Mr. Walker's case. Having accepted the principle, you will have to work it out, not I hope in such way as we have worked it out—our example may well be your warning—in such way I hope as may at once be consistent with truth and peace—but certainly not as a Free Church.

Some of our Clergy seem to think that if the property of the Church is confiscated, we shall presently have a Free Church, in which their lot will be free, and their power uncontrolled. But, independently of the power of the Laity, which they will have to feel, when the Laity are obliged to contribute out of their own funds for their support, I do not think that any of the restrictions the State has put on the Clergy would, if endowments are confiscated, be relaxed. Certainly the mere fact of confiscation would do nothing, as to rights not closely connected with the property confiscated, and I do not believe that any general cotemporaneous legislation would set the Clergy free, because they are of too much importance in society, and the Church too great a thing, in a national point of view, for that. I have no expectation, however, of any such catastrophe as the disendowment of the Church; rather, I think that the general power of the Church and its credit in society are rising.

Nor can you have a really free Church. Mr. Walker's case proves the supremacy of the State over your judicial proceedings; the State incorporation which your vestries have obtained carries with it your submission to the supremacy over your property. It may be that in the first matter your law courts acted with very laudable moderation; and that in the second, and in the general management of your Conventions, you have yourselves most carefully avoided anything irregular which might breed disputes, and so bring questions before the Courts of Law. You have in this done most wisely. But the State has not given up its power to deal with all questions between persons, and all disputes about property, and more especially to interpret for itself its own laws, as in the case of laws creating corporations, and cannot give up this power, without being false to its own nature and duties.

Now, our case differs from yours in this; that your external

Constitution is new, ours old, and that consequently we have a much greater quantity of laws and customs, with regard to which disputes may arise, the ultimate cognizance of which must appertain to the State, than you have; that our much more extensive Church property practically increases the extent of the State's jurisdiction; that we have a long series of decisions all in the main tending in the same direction, whether in earlier times directed against the Pope and the Clergy who were his adherents, or in Tudor and Stuart times supporting the autocracy of the Crown, or in later times extending and systematizing the principles of former decisions with a view merely to the liberty of the subject and his protection through the power of the Crown; that partly through our ancient policy of giving the assent of the State to the laws of the Church, and partly through the modern policy of merely governing the Church by act of Parliament, our Church Laws are also Laws of the State, and therefore necessarily subject, as such, to the interpretation of the courts of the State, and lastly, through a view which always has been prevalent among us, of a sort of divine authority in spiritual matters appertaining to the king. Such a notion I hold as little as you would. You are able to abstract the rights of the State from any idea of duty to an individual, a thing which is neither possible nor altogether reasonable with us. The error has been fostered by the modern continental notion of a divine right of kings in a different sense from the divine rights of other governments, which I conceive had its origin in the 17th century, and by the real difficulty of properly assigning the right bounds to the ideas of supremacy and loyalty, which has been aggravated by the different meanings given by Englishmen and Romanists to the word jurisdiction.

It is unavoidable, also, when a state of things such as prevails here has been formed gradually, by laws and decisions extending over many centuries, that popular feeling or the will of princes should have overridden right; and one age left to another a legacy of confusion, beyond its power to set straight; and that in some respects the wrong principles should be held to be right. We have suffered under one evil since the Reformation, which cannot but have been productive of great mischief, and that is our isolation. A Church confined to one country is tempted to manifold evils; its independence is apt to be rebellion, its obedience subserviency. Hence, the turbulence and internal troubles of the Scotch Presbyterians, and the prevalence of Erastianism in England. But we have had other and more subtle dangers. The insular feeling at-

tributed to us by our continental neighbors, has largely influenced our religion, making us proud of our own peculiarities, and scornful of those of others, so as to attach undue importance to some minor points, and to reject the views of others, rather because they held them, than from any proper and reasonable persuasion of the falsehood of the views. I trust this state of things exists no longer. Our Church now spreads into so many lands, and is brought into contact with men of such various views, that it is impossible but that our divines and writers will be called on to weigh and to tolerate arguments their forefathers did not meet with. The very fact too that our Church is following the example of our race and developing into many independent communities, will force our clergy to contemplate the international relations of Churches, and their influence one upon another. The result of this must be toleration; for we cannot compel you to a particular course, nor you us; and presently the colonies also will be altogether beyond the pretence of such a policy. It must often happen hereafter, that the larger and I hope the more sound part of our communion may have to tolerate some disposition towards error in a sister Church which it cannot hinder. It will then gain wisdom by reflecting and discussing the reasons which alone can justify cessation of communion, and the conditions, as to the clergy and their ministrations; and the laity, as to their rights, under which such a painful duty must be exercised; a discussion which cannot but throw a most valuable reflected light on the painful relations between our own Church and the rest of Christendom. As the branches of the Anglican Church consolidate, they will all do well to note the views which prevail among the others, as to the relations of Church and State, their discipline and peculiar institutions, whether religious or social. Every evil we recognize as having come to our common forefathers through isolation, supplies an argument for profiting by criticism of this kind. We all dislike to own it, when it comes home to us personally, that others know us better than we do ourselves, and that those who are free from our own prejudices, can best advise us. It is not quite the same certainly with nations as with individuals, opinions are intensified, and the expression of them is more in danger of being attributed to spite. And between Churches, differences, as history and our own experience testify, are embittered by time, and by attempts at reconciliation. But I have a good hope that this will not be so in the Anglican Church of the future. We start with a good will on all sides. We have more rapid means of intercommunication, improving and ex-

tending in a way never seen before. It must be our very grievous fault, if we do not merely control the differences which must arise among us, but also blend and modify our respective relations with the State by degrees, into one common system, recognizing the external advantages of peace and settled law, and the internal blessings of opinion freely developing itself, and establishing the unchangeable truths of Christianity, in the hearts of the whole people, by their own good will, and not by the power of the State.

Now, while I am obliged to allow that we are subjected to very great inconveniences, because the laws of our Church are also laws of the State, and to propose a course in my pamphlet which can only tend to make this union more close, it would be a great mistake to suppose, as I think I have recognized in some of your writers, that the Clergy here are generally subservient to the State, or that the Ministry have by their ecclesiastical appointments any real power over opinion in the Church. The case is far otherwise. But I must explain myself further, for some great dangers lie under these circumstances.

As to our Church laws being also laws of the State, I certainly look forward to the state of things, when they may be made by the general, perfectly free consent of Bishops, Clergy and Laity, and afterwards ratified by the State, as the best possible security for good ecclesiastical laws and due harmony between Church and State. I believe that under this state of things, the Church here will be able to speak as a whole to the State, with a power that cannot be resisted, in favor of those things which it really wants, while party feeling will be put aside, and any disposition to intolerance checked, both by the influence of the laity in the Church assembly and by the consciousness that measures which can fairly be charged with wrong will not pass Parliament. I look on the influence of the Church, when once brought into a focus, and cleared of sinister imputations, as amply sufficient to carry any measures through Parliament, and have little doubt, that our Churchmen may, if they please, establish a system, by which the honor of Church and State in the matter of legislation, may be duly saved, the Church being governed by canons enacted by its own assembly, but which each shall contain a clause that it shall not come into operation until the sanction of Parliament shall have been obtained in the usual way. No other sanction will suffice, not the Queen's sanction alone, nor yet that suggested by Mr. H. D. Evans, that the canons should be valid if sanctioned by her, provided the two Houses of Parliament had

not addressed the Crown to refuse its assent. Such a sanction might perhaps enact new laws, but could not operate to repeal any already in force, without which the new laws would be in almost every case inoperative. For my part, too, I must confess that I would rather have the sanction of the whole nation given openly by the Queen in Parliament, than merely through her in a more private manner.

Looking, therefore, at laws made by the joint action of Bishops, Clergy, Laity and the State as the best thing, I cannot but acknowledge with you that in laws made for the Church by the latter alone, there is the greatest danger. Against this we have now no safeguard, and we are just suffering under the Divorce Act which has been carried by the Government against the prevalent opinion of the Clergy and many of their flocks. Possibly it might not have been otherwise under any circumstances. In marriage and divorce are matters of mixed social and religious cognizance, and neither the opinions of our own people, nor the statements of our divines, nor, indeed, of any, before the middle ages, are clear on the point. With you it is a question which would have been left to the State alone. And while giving up to its jurisdiction freely all questions of legitimacy and heirship, you would be judges yourselves, each in his own circle, of those who availed themselves of the law to an extent you might think disreputable. We have also the latter resource, but it would, I think, be influenced by our respect for the law—a feeling which doubtless prevails also with you—that persons, not themselves tainted, who had merely used a privilege the law gave them, were not to be shunned. In this country, however, we cannot leave these questions to the State alone. The Church is too much intermixed with them, and I will add, too powerful for that. The ministers of religion do not confine themselves to their purely religious duties, but have a power over education, and mixed matters of public morality, which society sanctions when it is exercised with due discretion. On the proper exercise of their influence by our Synods in the future, much will depend, both to society and the Church.

The Church will have to take up the religious common sense of the people, and to give as high a tone to it as it will bear. I do not see any limits of the subjects to be handled, if only discretion is used, if, in standing out for our rights, disinterested honesty is observed, and if, in the more aggressive action on the corruptions and evils of society, care is taken not to go too far, or crudely and unreasonably to offend popular prejudices. It will be the function of the laity, in this,

to temper the zeal of the Clergy, and add practice to their theory.

The English Clergy are independent alike of the Government and of their people, and I may add of their Bishops, except of course where their conduct brings them within the law, and then I may safely say that, within the range of my own experience, I have never seen any hesitation on the part of the Bishop to take legal proceedings, though the whole expense of the prosecution falls upon him,* or any disposition in the Clergy to protect the guilty. Their independence of their people leads to parochial squabbles and estrangements, which are very painful and not unfrequent, but it also gives a grace to their good acts, which, I think, is appreciated by their people; to the care for schools, which now falls as so heavy a burthen on the younger Clergy; to their charities, and to the diligence with which the very great majority perform their ministerial duties. And I think I see that where, from difference of opinion, their ministrations are not to the taste of their parishioners, the liberality, forgetfulness of self, and single-mindedness which are observed are appreciated by their people.

But neither are the Clergy dependent on the Government. Formerly, to some extent, there was a system of promotion to Canonries, and Deaneries, and Bishoprics, and then of translation to still higher eminence, which may have made a certain portion of the more influential Clergy look to the Government, and avoid committing themselves to anything it might dislike. But, independently of the changes in politics, which have made the government more a peoples' government, and less of a Clergyman's government than formerly, the equalization of Bishoprics and Deaneries, and the limitations put on the holding of other Benefices with the latter, have altered this system of advancement. Still more, however, the appointment of parochial Clergymen, and of others not previously in the higher subordinate posts of the Church, or closely connected with the Universities, such as the Bishops of Lincoln, Salisbury and Ripon, has altogether altered the prospects

* I am the more desirous to say this because it is the fashion to blame the Bishops for lukewarmness when they do not move, and for tyranny when they do. I do not say that there may not be instances of both, but they are much less frequent than is supposed. Very often when public fame cries down a Clergyman neither the law nor the facts really ensure a conviction, and it may equally happen that the evidence, often given unwillingly, may be quite insufficient for a conviction, which had previously appeared to be most painfully satisfactory to the Bishop's advisers. In both cases public opinion, guided by the newspapers, judges according to the appearance, and does so unjustly.

of those who were formerly considered as journeying towards the highest places. Deans and Heads of Colleges are now fixtures. Divinity Professors in the Universities have not the chances they once had. And there really is no class that can look forward to Bishoprics except the very limited one of near relations of Cabinet Ministers or Statesmen, who are themselves able or presentable men, such as the Bishops of Gloucester, Carlisle, and Norwich. When the choice is made among the parochial Clergy, the chances of each man are so small that no one looks out for it, no one can wisely aim at it. Usefulness and notoriety may in the main govern the Premier, and yet the former may not be recognized and the latter make enemies. Dr. Hook has been talked of for every Bishopric for the last fifteen years, and yet he never will get one; and all men who take a strong view of their own, and are not adroit enough to get a good reputation without committing themselves, are sure to remain where they are. Politicians, therefore, will always be either enemies or ungrateful friends to the leading Clergy, and each successive ministry strengthens the cry among the Clergy for independence. It is much the same whether the change of ministry brings in the hereditary opponents of the prevalent party among the Clergy, or their friends, for the latter are unable to do what their friends wish. So far as this leads to a putting no trust in princes, it is all right, but I fear its going much further in the direction of an estrangement between the Clergy and people also. It ought to make the Clergy fall back on their people, but I fear that it will not. The Clergy are not exempt from the European continental feeling that the people must be governed and led in the sense of being *compelled* by some external power to do right, and failing the power of the Government, which many of them would like to use for this purpose, they fall back on the influence of property, and the hold over the poor which employers possess.

But more than this, and worse. The sort of things which Lord Palmerston said at the end of the debates on the Divorce Bill, stirs up the very feeling he desires to put down, and tempts the Clergy on to that quasi Romish defiance of the State, which might perhaps be their duty if the State were thoroughly anti-Christian, but which now can do nothing but increase the estrangement.

Again, I must remark, that in no case can the result be such an arrangement of mutual non-interference as prevails with you, the Clergy not meddling in politics, nor the State in religion. We are too much intertwined for that, and our

Clergy too powerful. They cannot, however, get that power to which some of them aspire, though in seeking it they may aggravate the Government and Parliament to encroachments, which may cause endless struggles, and lead to the spoliation of the Church, the increase of dissent among the Laity, and schisms among ourselves, and secessions to Rome from the Clergy. You will see, therefore, that I am justified in my remark that the Ministers of the Crown have no real power over opinion in the Church. If they have any, it unfortunately consists in a tendency to drive the Clergy in the opposite direction, by any interference of theirs, however well meant, and to increase our troubles and perplexities.

This danger must be set against the advantages we derive from the increased activity and efficiency of the Clergy. No one can guess whether good or harm will, in the long run, predominate. But I am quite sure of this, that if we had ecclesiastical institutions like yours, our dangers would speedily vanish, and our advantages have free scope. But it is time that I should notice some circumstances which may not be obvious to your readers, which tend directly to the greater efficiency of the Clergy, and to place them, as time advances, in a better position with their flocks. *

The Reformation left the law of Pluralities in confusion. There had been some restraints on the license of earlier times, but still benefices were conferred with regard to the emoluments, and not to the cure. There are still some of the older Clergy who hold two large parishes far apart, one or other of which may consist of two or more contiguous Churches, anciently united. And no wonder, when the Bishops themselves had Deaneries or other preferment, held, as it was called, in commendam, of which the ancient theory was that the charge was commended to their special care on account of their peculiar excellence, just as your Bishop might commend a poor outlying congregation, which is unable to elect its own Rector, to the care of some neighboring Rector; but the practice has been purely a question of money, the Bishopric being very poor, and the Deanery very rich, the latter was made to help the former. In this way Durham and St. Paul's helped Welsh Bishoprics,* and even the less opulent Deaneries, such

* The change has also improved the Episcopate. You will have noted in our history how largely Bishops have been translated. Laud, I think, reached Canterbury as his 4th stage, and so Hoadley and Tomline rested at last in Winchester. Of course it may have happened that these promotions, like their first advancement, were solely the reward of merit, but I fear that in most cases they tempted the Bishops away from the care of their dioceses to parliamentary intrigue, or rather I ought to say to make themselves useful there in a way not

as Wells, Christ Church and Canterbury, and Canonries of Durham and Westminster, as well as headships of colleges, and various livings, were made use of for this same purpose. It is hardly to be expected that Bishops who were obliged to take such advantages themselves, could be severe on the Clergy, who, for the most part, conformed to the law, of having only two benefices, or could duly check the non-residence which is the necessary consequence of plurality, or that, on the other hand, the parishioners could like it. I shall not easily forget some farmers near here saying to me, many years ago, about their Clergyman, "he never comes near us, but to take his tithes."

Now this is all in process of alteration; the Bishoprics and the Deaneries have been equalized, as I mentioned before, and the Bishop of Exeter is now the only one who has other preferment; no two livings can now be held which are more than ten miles apart, and there are limits besides, dependent both on population and value, and within these limits the license of the Archbishop is requisite. I am not sure that something more stringent still may not hereafter be desirable, and whether it is wise to leave so heavy a responsibility on the Primate, but there can be no doubt but that the change (which was made more stringent than had been intended by the House of Commons) is gradually destroying the evil of pluralities. And as was fitting, the license of non-residence is also much diminished, by a separate measure, which places the discretion in the Bishop.

The commutation of tithes has, I believe, tended very much to the peace of the Church. A sum has been fixed in each case, based, in general, on the value of the tithes received previously, and this is now charged on the landlord and not on the tenant, and varies according to the average price of grain for the last seven years; last year it stood at just its original value, this year at five per cent. above; it has never been so high before; the extreme limits of fluctuation have been ten per cent.; it is likely, as I should guess, to increase considerably, looking at it merely as a question of revenue. The Church, as a whole, has suffered through this arrangement,

useful to the Church. I remember hearing my father say when I was a boy, "I wonder ——— does not get a better Bishopric, for he is a dead vote with the ministry." There are now only the Archbishoprics and one or two minor prizes to tempt the Bishops. You have seen London, one of these, just given to a new man. There is now, therefore, hardly room for subserviency or jobbing. Success may secure promotion, and success will probably be for the future ensured, keeping a diocese quiet and efficient.

for, first, the commutation has been on the average receipts of the Clergy, which had generally been under the sums to which they were legally entitled, and secondly, since the tithe depended not on the value of the land, but on the produce, and as, on the whole, a good deal of land has been converted into tillage in England since the commutation, tithes would have increased, though the rent charge has not. The only counteracting advantage is that the tithe owner has a ready and sure mode for the recovery of his dues, the land, and not its fruits, the owner, not the occupiers, being answerable.

Your readers will recollect that Chaucer says of his virtuous and diligent parish Priest, that his people were loth to curse him for his tithe. It has always been felt as a grievance by the farmers, that their improvements and good cultivation should increase the tax upon them, and the higgling about the value, or the process of setting out the tithe, when taken in kind, if no agreement was made, were not things that would tend to comfortable feelings between the Clergyman and some of the more influential members of his flock, and have led to a traditional feeling of dislike of the Clergy among the yeomen, and to the increase of dissent, or at least absence from Church to spite the Parson. Now, as old feelings and dislike die out, I have no doubt that a much better understanding will exist between the Clergy and the yeomanry than heretofore. The Clergy are also now much less employed in secular matters than they used to be. Formerly, a very large number of them acted as magistrates; now, none are appointed, and in a few years they will have died out. I know not how the notion of a Clergyman acting as a magistrate may strike your readers, the views of the two countries are so different. Here it is not generally thought so very strange, and you may set it down as a fair instance of the extent to which the secular power and civil status of the Church are recognized by public opinion here. But I think that there can be no doubt, that the Clergyman has to look at the crimes and immoralities of his parishioners in a different way from the magistrate, and that it is not right that he should learn them in the latter capacity, or treat them with judicial impartiality. This change, therefore, tends to secure the purely religious character of the Clergyman from secular admixture.

Till within a few years, none but Quakers could be married otherwise than in Church; and Baptism was the only registration. Now, both are changed, with advantage, I think, both to the Church and dissenters. But yet, on the one hand, these changes are deplored by many of the Clergy, and on the

other, dissenters still come largely to the Church for marriage. I even heard of an instance, the other day, of a dissenting minister being married at Church, though his own chapel was licensed for marriage, and who got the Curate to give away the bride. As long as this attendance at Church was compulsory, it was a grievance to dissenters, and either an annoyance to the Clergy, or else an encouragement for empty pride in them. Now, if homage is freely paid to the Church, by those from whom it is not demanded, it can but be a ground of satisfaction, and a source of strength.

In the great towns of recent growth, where the Church and religion are altogether weak, great good will ultimately come from the new distribution of the cathedral property, to which I alluded before. Confiscation I cannot call it, since no part of the fund has been applied to the purposes of the State. The case is this: A very large amount of property belonged to the Bishops and the chapters collectively, and to the different members of the chapters separately. Nearly all this was upon lease for three lives, or twenty one years; and when a life had dropped, or seven years had expired, the Bishops, or other owners, would generally give a new lease, on the old terms, receiving as a fine, a sum varying from one year's rent to two and a half. He might, if he pleased, run the lives out, and sometimes did, and in that case a new lease was usually made on the same terms to some member of his family, and thus families have been enriched with the spoils of the Church. Our colleges at Oxford and Cambridge have very generally got rid of these tenures, and now receive the full rents of the lands; the Bishops and Chapters, for the most part, have left them as they were, and the separate estates of Deans and Prebendaries, are generally in the hands of the representatives of former incumbents. It is fair to say that the lifehold tenure is of very ancient origin. I believe there are indications of it in the Anglo-Saxon charters, and that both tenures, though bad in general, in that they check agricultural improvement, are convenient to land owners who have no time to devote to the details of the management of their property, because those devolve on the lessee. There is but one class of men which derives unmixed benefit, and that is the country lawyers, who act as stewards, and receive a heavy fee, on each renewal of the lease. Now, the first step of reform was to take the separate estates of the Deans and Prebendaries, as the incumbents died off, and vest them in the Ecclesiastical commissioners, who have now a very large amount of Reversions in their power. The chapters were

next dealt with, the number of the canons being diminished by not filling up each alternate vacancy; and the incomes of the stalls thus suspended—the late Bishop of Salisbury obtained the concession that the offices should not be abolished—being also vested in the commissioners. Since then, the measure has been carried further, many of the chapters, and also of the Bishops, having agreed to give up their property to the commissioners, receiving certain fixed payments from them. I think it likely that before long, all will come upon the new system.

It is open, of course, to the objection that it diminishes the influence and importance of the Church. You will not think so much of this as English ecclesiastics do, and rightly; for the proper influence of the Clergy comes from their spiritual functions, and not from their being great land owners; but it also increases the power of Parliament over the Church, which under existing circumstances is not comfortable. The lessees I have spoken of, are a powerful body. Many of them are members of the two Houses of Parliament, and others can influence the members of the Lower House as their constituents. They have always set up a claim of what is called tenant right, that having for a long course of years been allowed to renew their leases, on certain terms, they ought to be allowed to continue to do so; and these terms have been favorable to them, because old Bishops and elderly members of chapters have been willing to take what they could get, and not be at the trouble and ruinous expense of fighting a battle with their lessees, when the latter had only to wait till they were dead, and get no harm by doing so. After a long struggle, renewed on every occasion when any measures affecting these matters came before Parliament, the lessees got some words inserted in an Act, which regulated the commission some ten years ago, which gave a slight recognition of their claims, and I am not without fears, that the Ecclesiastical commissioners, who, for purposes of property, are, in fact, Lord Chichester and Mr. Walpole, may not be strong enough to resist the lessees, when they have to deal, as they are now doing, with this immense amount of property, selling a reversion here, and running out a lease there, at their discretion. The mismanagement of the Irish Ecclesiastical commission also increases our fears that the commissioners may muddle away the property. I have gone, however, into this digression about the commission, with a view to the practical and immediate benefits that have been derived from it. Sir Robert Peel's chief object in setting it on foot, was the improvement of our

large towns. Churches had been built, but there were no Clergy for them, and more were wanted besides. A large sum was therefore borrowed by the Ecclesiastical commission on the security of the property gradually coming into hand, and disposed of in stipends of £100, or £150, to the Clergy of new districts, whether with Churches or without, where the population is largest. Like a full meal to a famishing man, this measure has not proved so speedily salutary as might be wished; indeed, it could not, but in our children's time it will, I have no doubt, be recognized as the first great step for Christianizing our dense population.

At present the Church is weakest in the towns and among the middle classes, while the Clergy are the natural friends of the agricultural poor and the upper classes. Besides their extensive charities, the poor come to them naturally under any difficulty for advice, and it is very touching sometimes to see the confidence with which they will do whatever the Clergyman or the Magistrate advises them. With the upper classes the Clergy are connected by birth and education, and they mix with them on equal terms. You will observe that those classes who are most prone to act for themselves, and have not this family connection with the Clergy, are those over whom they have the least influence. It is unfortunate that independence and private judgment should thus lead to dissent, but it has been so, and there is no use concealing it. Indeed, there is besides a something of stiffness about the Clergy—not to mention the effect of the high claims of ecclesiastical authority put out of late—which tends to keep up the evil. I can see nothing so likely to remove it as the engaging the Laity in some work or other to assist the Clergy, whether in the parish or in higher functions, and a great deal has already been done through Sunday School teachers and district visiting.

I have already touched on discipline, and mentioned what is doing. We need more, however, and the Clergy will readily grant more ready methods of dealing with their delinquent brethren than heretofore, if they are freely consulted. The cry has hitherto been for cheap trials. I believe them to be impossible. No one can tell what difficult points of law may not arise in any trial—and if a blunder is made, down comes a Prohibition. The real remedy, I believe, is to provide a fund out of which the fair and reasonable costs both of the prosecution and of the defense, when the Clergyman is innocent, can be found. I know not how better to provide this fund than by a tax upon benefices.

Our law has hitherto dealt with only the more flagrant sins

of Clergymen. We need a power like yours to go more closely into a man's life and habits, and very much severer sentences than the law permits at present. Indeed, it may be a question whether those who make themselves unacceptable, and their ministrations useless, through their perversities, should not be removed. Better securities ought also to be had against the institution of improper and incompetent Clergymen. The right of patronage possessed probably by at least four-fifths of our members of the two Houses of Parliament, and the jealousy of the power of the Bishops, which the Gorham case has made memorable, make this a very difficult matter to deal with.

Lastly, it is desirable to find means for making more general use of special gifts among the Clergy, preaching, for instance, —and no longer making one man do everything, and every man the same. But as this evil exists with you as well as with us, I need not enlarge on it, and merely remark how extremely well the Clergy, as a body of men, on the whole, perform their very various duties.

But the reforms we want are larger in extent and more sweeping than the Clergy would by themselves propose. The recommendation of the Committees of Convocation have been very well so far as they went, but were not masterly, not broad enough for the wants of the times, and so it will always be. Elderly Clergymen, such as must fill our Houses of Convocation, will stick to the existing system, and the more earnestly they have striven to make the best of it, the more unwilling they will be to seek for something else. In council with them, the Laity may help them to frame the reforms which the times need; apart from them the very same suggestions of the Laity will have the appearance of hostility. And the distinction is not so unreasonable as it may seem at first sight. When such suggestions are made at first in the Legislature, the first thing that naturally occurs to the Clergy must be, Are these things, for which we are not prepared, to be forced on us by Parliament? Whereas, if the very same things were recommended by Laymen in an assembly where they and the Clergy could meet, with their relative rights duly fenced by the vote by Orders, or even were the measures resolved on as desirable by the Laity present, the feeling would be altogether different. The Clergy would know that the measures were not to be pressed on them against their will; and the sense of this would make them more ready either to accept them as a whole, or to make some compromise.

Besides the changes I have just indicated, which must in-

terfere with that darling of the English Clergy, the Parochial System, we need an increase of the Episcopate much greater than our Bishops are likely to propose, and further and much more sweeping changes in the chapters, so as to combine in them the city clergy with the Bishop's staff of helpers, for all kinds of diocesan purposes. In the way of this there are a host of obstacles; the dignity and importance of the Dean, and his appointment by the Crown, which makes it well nigh impossible that the Bishop and he should be permanently on those easy terms which would enable the Bishop to use him as an officer for the management of his diocese; the dignity of the Canons, and still more their being for the most part birds of passage, coming each to the cathedral for three months only in the year; the impossibility, at present, of permanently annexing any new diocesan office, such as that of Principal of the Theological College, or training school to a canonry; the jealousy between the cathedral body and the people in the city, which usually splits up the higher classes into several cliques, mutually speaking evil of each other, and drives the lower classes into dissent. Some of these evils can only be cured by time and the adroitness of good men, some are susceptible of improvement by legislation, but I fear that the proper measures will not be recommended by the present Convocation, in which the chapter influence is too powerful.

After all, in all these matters, we need the united strength of Clergy and Laity to be brought to bear on Parliament, wherever extensive change is required, or wherever existing rights must be interfered with, especially those of patronage belonging to the Crown or individuals. I may as well mention, also, that besides other difficulties, any large extension of the Episcopate must at once bring up the great innovation which has just been effected by the election of Bishop Cronyn in Canada, for on the one hand, the general sense of English Churchmen would revolt at making the new Bishops the nominees of the Crown, and on the other they are not prepared at present for the alternative of making them elective, like yours.

And here I may fairly be asked, what is my guess as to the prospects of religion among us. I can only reply, that it is most difficult to offer any opinion, since our religious prosperity depends not on the law, but the dispositions of men. I see more reason for discouragement in the awful social immorality disclosed by the great swindling cases last year, and in the bitterness and unthinking ferocity which has animated many otherwise good men about India, than in the fact of the Church

having been deprived of its ancient jurisdiction over divorcees and wills, or even in the changes which are making in the Universities. And I should fear these changes not so much as blows against the Church, but rather as possible—though I hope not likely—means of lowering the standard of morality and belief; dangers which I cannot rate as very high, since I hope our standard in these respects, as compared with other times and countries, is sound.

The external power of the Church, and the recognition of religion by the State, are often overrated among us, especially by the Clergy. I am disposed to think, that as the real functions of Government get to be more clearly understood, and to be separated from those which have been erroneously added on, we shall see that much that has been done in the way of depriving the Church of civil authority since the Reformation is right, and that more is necessary. And that individual righteousness is that which is pleasing to God and exalts a people, not the sham, collective and theoretical righteousness, which consists in exclusions for the sake of religion, or in those rights and authority and decencies of worship to which we cling so much here. Such things have no real value except in so far as they promote habits of religion and reverence among the people, or assist religious education. Laws and habits also have their religious aspects where they promote harmony and peace, and remove abuses, where they tend to make men each do his right work, not by dictation, but by merely removing the difficulties out of the way. I should fear such a repressive tyranny as exists in Europe, much more from its indirect effects in making warm hearted men into conspirators, and tinging the whole body with a habit of lying, than from its immediate evil; and you will see that I have based my hopes of a happy future for the Church of England in a great measure on the various laws lately made, which are calculated to promote its efficiency.

On the other hand we have deep-seated divisions; we have a state of things which tends to make many good men fall out with the Government, while I am unable to see any adequate amount of turpitude on either side to account for it; which tends to make the Clergy fall out with the Laity, when for the most part the fault lies in misapprehensions of each other's meaning. This sort of thing has exhibited itself between Lord Shaftesbury and some of the Bishops. I do not deny that there are not faults, and great ones; but there is desire to do good mixed up with them; they are not merely evil. Here, however, are stores of mischief, which the press amuses itself with embittering.

I know not to what it all will grow. It has happened that religious energy has ripened into mere bitterness and deadly hatred, and produced separations that have become incurable. It may be so again. But I hope it may be otherwise, and am pretty sure it will if we can find a way to combine the good dispositions of the different classes among us for practical improvement, checking but not crushing those whose wilder energies would lead to disunion if persecuted, but who are able to lead us to a higher good, if properly used and trusted.

I think it not unlikely that views I have expressed here and elsewhere in this paper, may not please your readers. It is possible that in the absence of any Church Establishment, and of aid given by the law to religion, some of you may overrate the advantages of them. With you, too, as well as with us, democracy has led to a recoil; and I doubt not you have many among you who worship Charles the First, just as here, M. Congreve exalts Roman Imperialism. Each may have his own opinion. I merely preface the remark, lest I might have been thought to have seasoned somewhat for an assumed palate; a thing I should think very foolish in me, and but a bad compliment to you.

I have wandered on from the few remarks I intended to make on our Ecclesiastical System, into the whole question of our reforms and prospects; but I do not like to close without a few remarks on the principal objections lately made to the entrusting a share in the deliberations of Synods to the Laity. Our Low Church party, which ought to have been foremost in the movement, since it has great strength among the Laity, has been of late altogether inactive. The more extreme and noisy part of it, represented by the *Record*, is altogether ignorant of your Church polity, and of the lessons which may be learned from it. Even the Committee of the Church Missionary Society, which includes many very able and zealous and good men, has been utterly unable to comprehend its position, and has met the propositions of the Bishop of New Zealand, and the plans of Colonial Church development of the last few years, with nothing but objections. I have given this party credit for a much larger influence in bringing about both our present prosperity and our High Church troubles, than some would think reasonable. It may seem strange that a party so large and operative should be destitute of policy, and look only at the present and the locality, but so it is. And the reason is plain. It breeds men who leave it as soon as a man gets larger and broader notions of the Church than prevail among them.

Our High Churchmen, again, who have met with some of

you on your visits to Europe, and taken the trouble to understand your ecclesiastical institutions, or who have been forced to do so by having to face difficulties in the colonies such as you have gone through, are generally satisfied with them and will introduce them, when they see their way to make them accord with our own institutions. And to them I must add some men whose tendencies are more or less decidedly towards the Low Church party, such as Mr. W. Thompson, Mr. Best, Mr. Waldegrave, Dr. McCaul and others. It is not impossible that they may be found to be more bold than High Churchmen, many of whom have had no opportunity yet of understanding your system, and merely see that externally it is a novelty. There is another influence also represented by the Ecclesiastic, and more moderately by the Christian Remembrancer, which will have power among the higher section of the High Church party against you.

The most important and definite shape in which this influence has been brought to play, seems to me very inconclusive. I allude of course to the late work of Dr. Pusey. A great amount of learning has been used to show, that it is wrong that the Clergy and Laity should have voices *coördinate* with those of the Bishops. Here a great deal depends on the meaning of the word *coördinate*; for if it implies that in the most sacred things, in the synods of the Church, Clergymen and Laymen should have votes individually equivalent to those of the Bishops, just as they have in the House of Lords, or the committees of our religious societies, I suppose there is no one among us who would not object. But if the word *coördinate* refer merely to separate bodies, having their rights defended by your rule of the vote by Orders, the case is different; and if the proof of the first case is quietly substituted for that of the second, I doubt if the victory is gained according to the rules of logic.

The meaning of your Constitution, as it works, and as it will be in strict theory, when saved from all cavil by the amendment of Article 3rd, which is now under the consideration of some of your Diocesan Conventions, is, that the Bishops are the ruling power of the Church; but that their decisions must wait until they have obtained the free sanction of your Clergy and Laity. The control which this implies has always existed. It is possible, of course, to imagine a time when all men shall obey at once what the Bishops tell them; we heard here some years ago, much about the power and authority of the slightest word of the Bishop, and I have no doubt the language was used in perfect sincerity; but very soon un-

comfortable circumstances compelled the very same men to exercise their own private judgment on their Bishop's words. And so long as Bishops are but imperfect men, it cannot be otherwise. Whenever, through suspicion of evil life, bad temper, heresy, bad policy, &c. the Bishops lose the confidence of their Clergy and Laity, the controlling power comes in—as it now largely operates in the Church of Rome—the Bishops get formal obedience, which must be rendered to them, and no true, no free willing help; and it is through such lip service that the Church decays. This is the lay-control which lies in the very nature of things, as a mere consequence of that side of religion which presents it to us a matter of opinion, and comes of thought and conscience, even among those who are most depressed. But the same thing has been done legally and formally when the Governments of the Continent in the Middle Ages established the Regale, mainly on popular principles, and with a view to the religious liberties of the people, however much it may have since been used to oppress them, and in more modern times by concordats. Even now the coördinate power has just been used in Spain, and used successfully, to compel the Pope to assent to the sale of Church property, and the diminution of feast days. In Sardinia the same power is used with greater vehemence, and I have no doubt this Pope or the next will yield to it; Continental Statesmen in fact, understand these things quite as well as ecclesiastics. In our sister Church in Scotland, the same coördinate power works through the vestries, and practically enslaves the Bishops and Clergy. I fear much it may compel them to give up their Scotch Liturgy. I need not say how it works here. It is enough to remark, how many things are not done by our Bishops, because they do not know how they will be taken; and what a sluggish tone it gives to our ecclesiastical administration. What you have done we want. The coördinate powers of the clergy and people need to be brought to a focus, and to be rendered intelligent; and then it will be seen that they are not really opposed to the Bishops, but are the most valuable adjuncts to their authority.

Probably much of what I have said will be admitted by many, who are under the potent influence I have alluded to. But it will be replied that the Laity, and perhaps the Clergy, ought not to be admitted to the discussion of doctrine in Synod. The objection and those who make it are equally deserving of respect. I should reply that the vote by Orders averts all danger. Painful discussions, and the scandal of having wrong opinions stated, amid the free speech which

must prevail in our Synods, cannot be prevented. But even in this respect, if the Records of your Church had been studied, instead of being misrepresented, it would have been seen that your practice is to discourage the meddling with doctrine in your Synods, while free scope is left for the proper teaching of doctrine in proper places by the Bishops and Clergy.

I must now conclude, and in doing so beg your readers not to judge of our state by the over-heated views of combatants in our religious strife. It is quite a comfort after reading a sermon of Archdeacon Denison to turn to a few pages of Mr. Fisher. The former proves that Church and State will soon be disunited, and that long sequences of evils will ensue. The latter is as clear on his side that Tractarianism must prevail, unless the words of the Prayer-book are altered; from which, according to him, Tractarians rightly prove a sacerdotalism and sacramentalism equal to or exceeding that of Rome herself. I do not say that we have no dangers of organic change; but the time is not yet gone by, when we may avert them, by means such as have kept you together during times which have broken up all the protestant denominations in your land, and while the Roman communion is troubled by dissensions and desertions such as you are free from. The time is not gone by, and even if it soon expire, I think that the bracing effect of the dangers which will then come upon us, will unite us—not without distress or loss, but with no loss which need be irreparable, and with a bright prospect for the future.

I fear I have neither performed my own intentions, nor acceded to your wish, in sending you these sheets. Such as they are, however, they are at your service, as a pledge at least of my wish that our Reformed Churches, the Mother and the Daughter, should understand each other, and borrow from each other whatever may be found to be best, and that the bonds of Unity may be strengthened between us, for common duties and common dangers.

I remain,

Yours truly,

F. H. DICKINSON.

ART. II.—THOMAS CRAWFORD,

DIED OCT. 10, 1857, *ÆT.* 44.

EXCEPT in the death of Washington Allston, American Art has suffered no such loss as in the death of Thomas Crawford. We are not sure that the exception even of Allston need be made. Since Art began to be in any way American, from the first of her votaries upon these shores, down to those who are now inspired in her service, it is no exaggeration to say that in many of the most striking qualities of the artist, Crawford stands above his brethren. Others have had greater delicacy, several have had a more general culture; the exquisite tenderness, the dreamy imaginativeness of more than one among the dead, of more than one among the living, are not the predominant characteristics of his works; he lacked elements which were in Allston, in Cole and in Greenough, not to speak of those who remain with us and who would reject, we doubt not, a word of appreciation at the expense of him who is gone. But whatever qualifications there may be to the remark, it still, we think, holds true that in industry, in vigor and in creative power, Crawford has no superiors, and, all things considered, no actual equals among the artists of America.

He was an American, in every true sense of the word. The crowning labors of his life, the objects for the completion of which he toiled so fervently and so uninterruptedly as apparently to shorten his days, were all American. Virginia will say it, the capitol at Richmond proclaims it, in pointing to the monument to Washington, reared in the State where he was born, and at the heart, as it was in his time, of the country which he may be said to have re-created. The Capitol at Washington bears the same testimony, as it adorns itself with the figures in which Crawford sought to represent the history and the destiny of the nation. We speak from personal knowledge, from recollection of words which we heard from Crawford's lips, when we say that in seeking and in executing these magnificent commissions, he was stirred by love of country as well as by love of art; that the hope of establishing

his fame among his countrymen was the brighter and the dearer from its association with the best memories and the best hopes of the Union.

True as we believe this to be, it is also true, and it involves no contradiction, that the name of Crawford carries us from America to Rome. The image which rises before us when we speak of him, is set, so to speak, on a Roman pedestal. The stamp upon his works, the sympathy between them and the monuments of yore, the evidences that the life-blood of classic and of mediæval art runs in the veins of his great productions, all speak of studies and of impressions belonging to Rome, the city of Art, as truly as it is the city of the Cæsars or the Pontiffs. We once had the ill fortune to fall in with an American artist who came, as we thought, to behold the marvelous works of the Vatican and the Capitol, to drink in the inspiration of Phidias and of Michael Angelo and of Raffael; but we were mistaken. He came to look at what the great masters had left to him, and to turn away, with some such words upon his lips as "It is all very well for those who need a model, but I don't." The war-whoop of "American originality," would probably have followed, had we stayed to listen. Not such the spirit of Crawford. He repaired to Rome and he resided there, because there were his masters, dead, indeed, in the flesh, but still living in their paintings or their sculptures; because he was not of those who avoid homage to great works or great names, but rather belonged to that smaller number who take less pleasure in looking down upon their inferiors than in looking up to their superiors, who find strength in humility, animation in reverence, and a holy calmness in the guidance and the companionship of God's chosen instruments amongst men.

We have often heard it regretted that so many of our artists should live at a distance from us, that the influences from personal intercourse and constant example are beyond any others they can exercise, far beyond the speech of the canvas or the aspect of the marble which they send home to be their representatives. In such regrets we confess that we have often shared. The work of the American artist, as a general rule, seems but half done when it is done abroad. England can spare her painters or her sculptors; France can part with hers; the nations who have grown gray in art would not miss half their artists, if half were to migrate beyond their borders. But we are younger, our artists are fewer; if but a handful go, less than a handful remain. We lose the atmosphere of the studio, we lose the atmosphere of the

man himself, his purposes, his achievements; we behold the work as it is completed, but we know nothing of its conception or its progress; we clap our hands and add another leaf to his laurels, but we do not see how he wears the leaf or the chaplet, how he grows with our applause as we grow with his teaching. All this is a loss, an immense loss, to us, and we doubt if there is any proportionate gain, in the majority of cases, to him. Materials may be cheaper, models and workmen more easily procured; a better studio may be had, a more romantic, perhaps in many senses a more inspiring home; the galleries of Rome, if Rome be his abiding place, the Churches, the ruins, the stretching Campagna, the hazel-clad mountains, art and nature, the present and the past, all throw a lustre round the artist, as indeed they do around every man of sensitiveness or of earnestness, who dwells for any length of days in the Eternal City. But we doubt whether any or all of these advantages make up for the precious opportunities which the artist of our country casts behind him when he expatriates himself for life. The power he could exert over his countrymen, if he lived amongst them, would be more to him, we do not hesitate to say, than the power exerted by Roman art or Roman scenery, on him; it would return to him, blessing him as its source, quickening his energies, heightening his successes, and covering his head with a halo such as only human sympathy and human usefulness, in the sight and love of Him from whom both proceed, can ever suspend above a mortal brow.

Notwithstanding this be true, every word of it, as we believe, and have long believed,—we do not, we cannot regret that Crawford spent the better portion of his life at Rome. We could not regret it, were it only on account of the happiness which he found there; but of this we are not speaking. We do not regret it, because, if we understand him aright, he was a man whose character was more likely to mature as it did mature, beyond immediate contact with the prevailing habits of action, thought and life, amongst us. We speak, of course, in a very general way, but we do not wish to be misunderstood. We do not mean that there are none among us to appreciate, none to call out and elevate such a man as Crawford. Far from it. Nor do we mean that he found none here to respect, none to trust in, none to improve him by their conversation or their career. Far from this, likewise. But taking our society as a whole; viewing its unfledged condition so far as art and intellectual culture are concerned; beholding its devotion to material objects, its clashing interests,

its rigid prejudices; in short, accepting the descriptions of it that are constantly drawn among ourselves, we shall not catch at the idea that its influences must be for the better, no matter what the object on which they are exercised. Crawford was a man of peculiar sensitiveness, especially in the earlier part of his artist life. He was reserved, to some extent rugged and defiant, and at times possessed with the morbid prognostics so natural to a man struggling against the odds which he was called to meet. Ten years in New York, instead of in Rome; and the whole course of his life might have been changed. When, under what to him were more genial skies, he had nobly worked his way through obscurity and privation up to the rising slopes of reputation and employment, it might still have proved adverse to his development, had he returned to live amongst us. We cannot say what would have been; we cannot point to this or that element of character in him, or to this or that source of influence here, and lay bare the exact results of contact. We must rest our expressions where we took them up, in the mere conjecture that it was well for Crawford, well for the cause which he served, that he did not spend his days amid his countrymen.

If in anything that precedes or follows we speak of our own impressions and experiences regarding Crawford, it is not done with the desire of bringing forward ourselves. To take the opposite course, and say nothing of a personal nature, would be unjust to him of whom we speak. His power as an artist will be brought out more naturally and more freshly by writing exactly as we would talk of him, without a thought of self-importance, and yet, with frequent self-allusion.

It was in quite youthful days that we first heard of Thomas Crawford, and first beheld a work from his chisel. A Bostonian wrote from Rome in the summer of 1839, describing the sculptor and his productions, especially a statue of Orpheus which Crawford was then at work upon. The next year a subscription was raised in Boston, and the statue ordered for the Boston Atheneum. In 1841 the work arrived, and was at once exhibited. Its reception, prepared by the interest recently excited with regard to its author, was earnest and even enthusiastic. With all the feeling for the sculptor, however, the idea suggested by the name of his statue had been that he was but adding one more to the host of mythological sculptures, that he was only another follower of the so-called Classic school, more original and more successful than the majority of imitators, but still one of their number, an imitator

in spirit, if not in the mere details of form or treatment. How these forebodings vanished at the first glimpse of the Orpheus! The name was still of mythology, the story was still of mythology; but the life of that marble figure was of a deeper source than ever mythology opened. The imitator, the adherent of the Classic school would have represented the poet returning from infernal triumph; unreflecting satisfaction and soulless beauty would have slumbered upon his features, as he ascended, Eurydice following, the victory achieved. Crawford seized another moment in the legend. Orpheus is descending, the enterprise is but begun. Cerberus, the guardian of the lower world, sits nodding at the feet of the enchanter; the instant he yields to the spell, Orpheus drops the arm by which he held the lyre, and raising the other hand to screen his sight as he gazes down into the abyss, begins his descent of awe and of agony. It is the effort after what is as yet unattained, the tremendous concentration of mind and body on the point to be secured, the entire devotion to the object before him, that makes the Orpheus of Crawford a symbol of all effort, all concentration, all devotion on the part of man. Mythology vanishes; its absorption in the past, in the deeds that have been done, in the rewards that have been won for them, is not here. We see the struggle towards the higher achievement, the more glorious recompense of the future; the heart-throbs of humanity are in this straining form. It is not the first time that the statue has been recognized to be the embodiment of its author's experiences; just as the Orpheus presses forward, every nerve stretched to win the prize on which life and joy depend, so the young artist, with eager eye and active limb, a world of power and of hope within, was striving after the success which should set the seal on his career.

He prevailed. Before Boston welcomed the work which he had achieved, it was welcomed at Rome. If it did not excite any general enthusiasm, it was cordially appreciated by those whose appreciation was the most encouraging. "I know," wrote the English poet Kenyon, "that Thorwaldsen esteems Crawford as his successor in the severe Classic style of sculpture." For himself, Kenyon wrote as follows: "If Crawford is sustained in his art, and keeps his health, he will be the first of modern sculptors; nay, an American may rival Phidias. . . . He is the artist who and whose works most struck me in all our journeyings on the Continent." And so the still youthful sculptor rose to the rank of a master, not indeed in his maturity, but in the glow of promise, the morning light upon his path and his uplifted brow.

Crawford was not yet thirty. Born in New York in 1813, he had been educated in the common way, until, at a very early age, he showed such exclusive interest in drawing and experimenting, as it may be styled, upon art, that he was allowed to go to a drawing school, and to spend his leisure hours in haunting the rooms where prints and paintings were sold. Still a boy, he entered at his own choice, the service of a wood carver, with whom he soon became a much more than commonly successful workman. In his spare time, he studied architecture, and worked at the school of the National Academy; as he could, he collected casts, and for his reading, devoured the biographies of celebrated artists. A little later, he passed into the employment of some monumental sculptors, and while laboring for them, found the opportunity of making several busts, the first of his works, we believe, as a sculptor. But there was nothing in these toils or changes, to satisfy his ardent aspirations. Rome was already in his vista; whichever way he looked, he seemed to see the same city of hope; and thither, unprovided and unfriended as he was, he resolved to go. He left New York at the age of twenty-two.

The lonely voyage, the unwelcomed landing at Leghorn, had no effect upon his resolutions, except to confirm them. "I am determined," he wrote from Leghorn, "to be at the top of the ladder or buried under it." Journeying on, he came to Rome. A letter of introduction given him by one of his employers in New York, opened the way to Thorwaldsen, then the great sculptor in Roman as well as European eyes. From him, Crawford received the most genial welcome. Thorwaldsen threw open his studio to the young American, asked him to work there, if he pleased, and aided him by kindly counsels and instructive criticisms. Nothing could be sincerer than Crawford's respect and gratitude. He always spoke of Thorwaldsen as of a benefactor, as well as an example; nor would any sketch of the circumstances affecting his development be even decently just, which did not recognize the influence which Thorwaldsen exerted upon the genius of his pupil and his brother in art.

We have spoken of all these early experiences in Crawford's life as if they had succeeded one another smoothly, and borne him on gently to the position which he reached. But it was one long dark valley that he had traversed, as full of sufferings as of studies, of forebodings as of aspirations. Nor was the end yet. From 1835, the year when he reached Rome, until 1840, when the order for the Orpheus was given, the sculptor's path was one of privation, and, too often, of

gloom. "He is struggling for bread," wrote his English admirer; worse still, worse to a spirit like Crawford's, was the struggle for recognition as an artist, which, if it came, as it did at times, seemed to be withdrawn again, leaving the prospect sadder and heavier than ever. Who that ever felt the power of working, without the opportunity; who that ever aspired to labor for his fellow-men, without a token of interest from them, but can enter into Crawford's feelings, and sympathize with his agonies? It was his ordeal, and he bore it. Never envious of others' success, never exaggerating his own powers, never relaxing his exertions, he studied, toiled, copied, created. Every effort brought him nearer to the dawn, and at length the modeling of the Orpheus heralded the morning. It was not, however, until the statue found a purchaser that it could be put in marble, and take its place as one of the enduring monuments of art. Then, finally, the day may be said to have broken.

It was our privilege, a year or two later, to meet him. It was more than a privilege, indeed, to know such a man in such a spot—to enjoy his experience and to share his enthusiasm amid the labyrinth of art in which the new-comer loses himself, if he is alone, and in which an older wayfarer walks on less steadily without a companion. To say that Crawford appreciated what was around him, is not enough; as we remember him, he was a part of the place; not the spectator upon the walls, scanning the tower or the dwelling from afar, but the sojourner in the heart of the city, familiar with its resources and its interests, and ready to defend them. At a later time, when the days of Pius IX arrived, rousing the Roman people to fresh graspings after what was and still is but a shade to them, Crawford enlisted in their Civic Guard. Some of his countrymen remonstrated with him, but he adhered to his Roman colors: "I shall not separate myself from my own country," he said, "by defending my adopted one." From the earlier years of his life at Rome, his spirit was the same, his affections alive as well as his tastes, and his whole nature expanding with the daily impressions which he received. This is high praise, or meant for such, befitting not only the earnest artist but the earnest man.

Crawford now had a studio of his own, which, though not as much sought out at this time as in after years, was already one of the artistic points of Rome. It was the studio of an artist, not of a stone-cutter or of a copy dealer, but of one who was devoting great powers to a great work. If you sought the evidences, you found them the moment you entered the outer door.

There were three rooms in those days. First was a large room filled with the casts of completed works, and now and then a bas-relief, or a head in marble, waiting to be ordered or to be sent away. The subjects were of the most various kinds; portrait busts, ideal heads from poetry or legend, groups from fiction or from real life. If you saw anything to criticize at once, it was the want of finish. You would be struck with the idea that the affluence of imagination had led to some neglect of execution; nor would you be far from right. The exquisite surface upon the works of other sculptors, far less fertile or artistic than Crawford, seldom appears in his statuary; it is as if he had grown impatient of spending mechanical labor upon a piece of sculpture, when another piece was waiting for his creative power to give it life. "I regret that I have not a hundred hands," he wrote in 1843, "to keep pace with the workings of my mind." It is so much loftier art to conceive than to carry out a conception to its last point of completeness, so much higher to be an imaginative artist than a dexterous one, that we cannot wonder at the preference apparent in Crawford's productions. On the other hand, if we were arrested by any preëminent merit in his works, it would be his sentiment; in other words, the expression of the thought, the emotion or the character appropriate to the subject, whether it were a Cupid or a Hebe, a child at play or a Washington with a nation on his hands. It is characteristic of the man as of the artist, that the higher his subject, the more successful is his treatment; ask of him a parlor ornament, and you are gratified with what he shows you; ask a National Monument, and you are overawed. Beyond the room in which we have lingered so long, there was a smaller apartment, a sort of sanctum, though over rude to be called by such a name, where Crawford worked up his models. Some large figure, as yet half-shapeless, occupied the centre of the room, while at one side or in the corners, stood some smaller work upon which the sculptor would employ himself at intervals. Here those who knew him well enough, or rather those whom he knew well enough, were welcomed at almost any hour; he would talk as he worked, and work, it seemed, with all the greater effect, for the interest he took in the conversation. Above this modeling room was a loft to which one ascended with some difficulty, but in which, when he got to it, he found even more marvelous signs of Crawford's genius than he had seen below. The chamber was full of sketches, rude casts from rudely modeled clay, made but to hold fast the image that had floated by day or night, into

the artist's mind. "I think of such or such a thing," Crawford said, "while I am working at my model; it haunts me, it interferes with the matter I have in hand; but if I just make a sketch of it, such as you see, it leaves me at peace. So too, at night, I am kept awake by some fancy or other, until I get up, strike a light, and make my little model out of the clay that I always keep near me." We remember those words as well as if we had heard them yesterday; they carry us back, as we write them down, to that upper room, where, amid the progeny of his prolific imagination, surrounded by designs of every name and form, none worthless, none, we dare to say, inferior, but all infused with suggestive beauty, we first comprehended how great an artist, in the highest sense, was Crawford. No other studio in Rome, at least to our knowledge, had such a chamber; no other artist, to our knowledge, could say that his work or sleep was constantly interrupted by the thronging creations of his genius, the embodied forms of memories and hopes, of reveries, struggles, and prayers.

Crawford was of a party that visited the Vatican one evening, by torchlight. It is perhaps the most wonderful of your Roman experiences, to traverse those long galleries, pausing here and there amid the dark and silent shapes on either side, to throw the light of the torches upon some single figure, and behold it start, as it were, into being. The pale marble assumes a fleshly tint; the rigid limbs seem to relax, the eyes to move, the lips to unclose; you see the hero or the matron of ancient days almost as their contemporaries saw them; you behold the god or the goddess inspired with a life such as their worshipers of old never beheld, unless they, too, made their torchlight visits to the shrines of their divinities. With the sensations excited by this resurrection of the dead, Crawford was familiar; but he gave himself up to them as readily as the freshest of the party whom he accompanied. We recall him, now, as he stood by the statue of Demosthenes, disposing the lights so as to bring out the best points of the majestic figure, and then pointing without a word, to the effect. It was not long since he had made a copy of that very statue; too poor to have his time free for original composition, he had hired himself out as a copyist to earn his bread and his shelter. We do not know whether he was set about the task by his employer, or whether he chose the Demosthenes for himself. If he had the selection to make, he could have found no work more congenial to his own genius, none, in copying which, his highest powers as an artist would be more advantageously stimulated and disciplined. The Demosthenes

owes its majesty to no spasmodic action or exaggerated expression. The great orator of Greece stands exactly as we can conceive him to have stood on rising to address his countrymen ; the consciousness of strength is there, the fulness of principle and of purpose, but all is calm, the wind not yet agitating the waters, nor the spray rising above the cliffs. Crawford's great work at Richmond is of the same order as the Demosthenes ; the same suppressed power, the same reliance upon simple rather than strained expression characterizes both ; and the inspiration of the elder artist is renewed in the creation of the younger. While on that evening visit to the Vatican, Crawford stood reverent before the almost living and breathing form, one of our companions was running up and down, endeavoring to convince us that one of the legs of the statue was shorter than the other. O, the complacency of criticism ! To meet Demosthenes, as it were, face to face, to hear, it well-nigh seemed, the roll of the opening Philippic on his lips, and yet be totally absorbed in comparing the length of his nether limbs !

Crawford's trials were not yet over. Commissions increased, but they did not multiply ; the bas-relief would linger without a purchaser, and the group, whatever applause it might obtain, still stood in the studio. Flashes of brightening fame broke in upon the artist ; but the heavens often appeared to be hung with black, as he looked about him, and contrasted his fortunes with those of painters or sculptors whose talents, collectively, were hardly equal to his own. As the sympathy of a countryman, aroused by the Orpheus, had borne him up in yet more trying times, so in these, another countryman, a closer and a dearer friend, sustained the sometimes sinking spirit, and led the way to brighter days than the artist had ever known.

A year later, in 1844, Crawford married. He was one of whom you would say, intentionally and definitely, what is so often said without any peculiar meaning, that marriage would improve his character and quicken his powers. That gentle nature, now touched within him, was just what was needed to heighten his excellences and to tone down his defects. A happy home made a happier studio. Devotion to wife and children softened and yet elevated his devotion to art. He had chosen one who could rouse his genius as well as fill his heart, one, whose sunny love chased away the morning vapors, and brightened every hour of the noontide until the close.

And now work followed work, creation succeeded creation, as it had been the sister-hours dancing in the progressing day.

He pursued the same paths as of old ; but some became more attractive than others, and at times, he seemed to be opening a new way. Thus the domestic and the Scriptural lines of production appear to have been more earnestly followed ; the bust of the wife, finished as no other work of his chisel had ever been ; the group of an angel teaching children to pray ; such subjects as these were of a higher promise than any on which the artist had labored. It was not for the first time, however, that Crawford had turned to religious art. One of his earlier works, we believe, was a bas-relief, whose inscription, "Lead us into life Everlasting," explains its character. Other bas-reliefs, suggested by the Old Testament and the New, followed at intervals. The Adoration of the Magi, the Interview with the Doctors ; the Meeting with the Samaritan Woman, the Blessing of Little Children, the Raising of Jairus's Daughter, and the Resurrection of OUR LORD, were amongst the thank-offerings of the Christian artist. His progress to holy thought and holy productions finds its symbol in a statuette of his own, the subject of which was suggested to him,—The Christian Pilgrim. The shoon and scallop-shell are there ; there, too, is the staff surmounted by the cross, while the aspect of the figure, the gaze upwards and forwards, speaks yet more strikingly of the Christian. Would that there had been more Christians in the flesh to encourage the devotional imaginings of the sculptor ! That the orders for the sacred subjects, the execution of which would have done him and the world good, had borne some larger proportion to the commissions for *Psyches* and *Medoras* !

A very remarkable work of the higher class is the sketch of Adam and Eve on their expulsion from Paradise. Eve clings to her husband's breast ; and he raises his clasped hands above her head, as if to shield her, and to deprecate for her rather than for himself the punishment of their common sin. The ordinary idea of his deception and of his subsequent indignation, has no recognition in this group ; the man is the sinner as well as the woman, indeed, even more so ; he, too, bears or is willing to bear, the chastisement, rather than that she whom he is bound to protect, should be overwhelmed.

Crawford's genius was maturing fast. With all our knowledge of his power, we were surprised to find how great it had become during the winter of 1849-50, which he passed in this country. It was the second time that he had come back from Rome to spend the winter among his friends. While he was in Boston, he had a room in one of the office buildings of

the city. Nothing could have been more cheerless than the bare walls and unfurnished corners of the chamber; it was just the cold, ungenial atmosphere in which art might be supposed to give one convulsive gasp, and then die out in despair. In that bare room, however, Crawford went to work upon his design for the Washington Monument. A day or two passed, and the foundation was laid; then figure after figure was placed upon its pedestals, until high above the whole, Washington sat his horse, as grandly conceived and as effectively presented, as if the sculptor had had a studio in the Capitol or at Mount Vernon. He was not inspired, according to his own expressions, with the hope of success, that is, he had very little expectation of receiving the commission from the powers that were at Richmond. The greater the strength, therefore, that could triumph at once over the forebodings of disappointment, and the discouragements of circumstance; the greater the strength that could call up a Washington, surround him with illustrious Virginians, and bear away from a committee to whom the sculptor was previously, we believe, altogether unknown, the order to execute the work as he had designed it, and to crown the memory of the dead with the noblest tribute ever offered to them by Art.

That was a triumphant moment, and he felt it to be so. "I have received the Virginia Commission," he said to his friend and fellow-artist, Mr. Thomas Hicks, as that gentleman tells us in his very feeling and impressive eulogy lately pronounced upon Crawford before the Century Club of New York, "and it is the first real chance I have ever had to do what I want to." No one who knew him doubted his improving the chance; no one doubted his entire ability to show himself equal to the mighty enterprise with which he was entrusted. The first great commission was matched by a second. A number of the works intended to ornament the Capitol at Washington, were committed to Crawford—a national recognition of his genius. There was a feeling among us which extended beyond him, that the time was come, the golden hour arrived, when the character of American art was to be redeemed; when the chosen sculptor of the nation was to achieve works worthy of comparison with the greatest works of ancient or of modern sculpture; when the country was to be rescued from her dependence on foreign artists, and to rejoice in a Phidias of her own, as Mr. Kenyon had vaguely prophesied ten years before.

If we could have looked forward, there would have been a

shade of apprehension mingling with our exultation. With all our experience of Crawford's industry, we could not foresee how untiringly he was to devote himself to these undertakings, nor to these alone, but to other works as well as these, and with such extraordinary effect that twenty statues are said to have been the fruits of eighteen months' exertion. It is stated that the disease of which he died cannot be traced directly to any excessive labor, and yet it seems impossible but that there should be some connection between toils so arduous and a malady so unexpected and so fatal. But to this we did not look forward when we congratulated the artist and the nation, that the works at Richmond and at Washington were to be executed by Crawford. We saw him as he was then, in his prime, in the fulness of power and of hope; we did not see him as he was soon to be, stricken down, wasting away, and dying.

Amongst the productions upon which Crawford employed himself at the same time that he was working upon the sculptures for Richmond and Washington, was one which, in some respects, is the greatest of his creations. It is the statue of Beethoven, in the Boston Music Hall. The commission came from one of the artist's most cherished friends, one to whom Crawford felt himself under peculiar obligations. It was ordered in a most munificent spirit for a public purpose, to adorn, one might almost say to consecrate, the structure which had been reared to the honor of Music and the Arts. Affection for the friend, devotion to the cause which the friend was so nobly supporting, formed the twin-inspiration of the sculptor. He turned to the shade of Beethoven; he found it encompassed with ignorant prejudices on the part of the living, even of those who profess to revere the composer; he found it dwarfed to ignoble proportions, and surrendered to the impressions of repulsive infirmities. It is no exaggeration to say that he restored the great master to the stature of which he had been bereft, and to the elevation from which he had been deposed; that the mighty workings of genius, its glorious utterances, its solemn trials, are all in that one sublime figure, at whose command the burst of immortal harmony pours forth from encompassing silence, and fills the listening air. What biographer can rival such a life of Beethoven as this? What musician, what double, or treble, or monster orchestra, can ever interpret Beethoven's compositions more thoroughly than they are interpreted by this solitary statue?

The Beethoven, a bronze statue, was cast at the great foundry in Munich. On its completion, the anniversary of the compo-

ser's death—March 26, 1855—was kept by a musical festival, as much in honor of the sculptor as of the musician. The statue, surrounded with wreaths and flowers, occupied the conspicuous place in the hall; a prologue was recited; and a band of three hundred performers, orchestra and chorus, united in Beethoven's music. Amongst the throng of spectators was the king of Bavaria, who said his only regret was to let such a master-piece be removed from his Capital.

A year later, we think it was, and the Washington was cast at the same place. The director of the foundry gave an entertainment to the artist; the workmen would not allow any other hands than theirs to move the bronze or lift it to the wagon on which it was to be transported; and the king ordered that it should pass toll-free over his roads and bridges. Meanwhile, Crawford was elected an honorary member of the Royal Academy of Munich, and then of other bodies, from the Academy of St. Mark at Florence, to that of St. Petersburg. Behold, now, the sculptor's fame grown world-wide.

He bore his honors nobly, even more nobly than he had borne his adversities. These had never quenched the fire within him, but they had drawn about him the shadows of distrust and reserve. His successes left him as true and as generous as they found him. He was no changeling, as he said in a letter to one of his friends, and the aspirations of his early years were but widened as he rose to the prospects of middle life. He had never been jealous of more successful artists; he had never decried the capacity of men in favor with the multitude when he was in obscurity; nor did he now set himself above them, however loftily he was raised by the applauses of Europe and America. But more than this; as he ascended, he bent back to look upon those who were still climbing from the base. He rejoiced to lend the struggling artist a helping hand, to say an encouraging word, to do a kindly action; never forgetting his own struggles or the sympathy which they inspired with the struggles of others. Another striking characteristic of his nature appeared in his opening graces under the influence of prosperity. Instead of wrapping himself in isolation, he rather threw it off; the reticence and rigidity of other times disappeared; he was more cheerful, more out-spoken, more sympathetic than he had ever been; the color of his life grew richer, its very substance more generous beneath the sunshine that streamed upon him.

Amongst his last works were those for the Capitol at Washington. We can describe them only at second-hand; but the mere mention of some of the subjects and of their treatment, suffices to suggest their grandeur. A pediment for one of the

new wings is composed in this manner. At the centre stands a colossal figure of Liberty; upon one side is a line of figures representing the progress of the country from barbarism to civilization; at the extreme left an Indian group, warrior, squaw and child, near the graves of their fathers; then, advancing towards Liberty, the white hunter emerging from the forest just as the backwoodsman is felling it to make room for his fields. On the other side, a soldier in the uniform of the Revolution, a merchant, two young volunteers, a teacher and his pupil, and an artisan, fill the ranks of civilized life. Each figure has its appropriate emblems; the powers of society are represented as well as its individual members, and the whole array, silent and motionless as it is, calls up the comprehensive marches of humanity. Even more impressive must be the single colossal figure of America that is to crown the dome of the Capitol. She wears the helmet, eagle-crested; her right hand is upon her sword-hilt; her left, holding a wreath, rests upon a shield, embossed with stars. It is the Union, full of majesty, full of peace; an ideal, alas! in these days, but an ideal that may not be without its influence in restoring or establishing the real.

Crawford's labors were left only for a visit to America. He came in the summer of 1856, visited the spots where his great works were to be placed, made his arrangements for their completion, and then gave himself to brief communings with his friends. They rejoiced to see him in the full measure of his strength and his renown; and when he left them, they followed him, dreaming of the achievements that were to come, as they thought, in the yet long years apparently before him. A twelvemonth after his departure, all that was mortal of him returned to be committed to the dust.

We will not attempt to describe the intervening year. Its opening with disease, bravely resisted, then yet more bravely borne, has been related in obituary notices that must still be fresh in our readers' recollection. Its continuance amid suffering the most intense, and resignation the most heroic, with the blessed lights of Faith blazing more brightly as the damps of Death gathered more thickly, when

"Those hands that nobly wrought,
And truth enamored sought,
The chisel loosened then—to fold in prayer;"*

* From Mr. Henry T. Tuckerman's exquisitely sympathetic verses upon the Funeral of Crawford.

this is beyond our words, beyond all but the memories of those to whom it is a life-long consolation that so noble a career should have had so holy a close.

One word more, and we have done. It is not to recapitulate what we have tried to say as we went on of Crawford's genius or of Crawford's works. It is not to add to what has been said by others about his early death, or the memory which lives, and will live, as we believe, for ages. But it is to repeat what he said years before he died, upon the hope of American art:—"I look," he wrote, "to the formation of a pure school of art in our glorious country. We have surpassed already the republics of Greece in our political institutions, and I see no reason why we should not attempt to approach their excellence in the fine arts." Recall what he wrought, his fidelity to patriotic associations, to the universal sentiments of humanity, above all, let us add, to the yet more universal principles of the Christian Faith, and we shall comprehend what he meant by "a pure school of art." Then let us turn ourselves, if we are artists, to carrying on the work, and if we are not artists, at least to the hope and effort that the work may be carried on as it has been begun by Thomas Crawford.

ART. III.—PROPOSED LITURGY OF THE GERMAN REFORMED CHURCH.

A Liturgy: or, Order of Christian Worship. Prepared and Published by the direction and for the use of The German Reformed Church in the United States of America. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858.

THE appearance of this remarkable book may constitute an era in the history of Christianity in this country; and we begin our notice of the work by repeating this profound and far-sighted remark, uttered in our hearing by the lamented Bishop Hobart: "*The non-Episcopal denominations will gradually approximate towards our Church; but the last point in which they will conform, will be that of the ministry.*"

In how many particulars has this memorable prediction already been literally fulfilled!

* Attachment to the novel system of the celebrated John Calvin, aroused among his followers, whether English or Scotch, Irish or Swiss, Dutch or German, such a spirit of opposition to all the institutions of Episcopacy, that their establishments everywhere differed as much as possible from those they abandoned. Whatever may have been their nationality, when the Calvinists emigrated to America, they brought with them the same adverse spirit, and perpetuated the identical hostile separation. This sad fact was patent in every arrangement of theirs; especially among the first settlers of New England and their descendants for several generations.

Instead of the noble Christian architecture which, with its arched naves, its lofty windows and its towering spires, appeared in the middle ages, and is still the marked feature and attractive ornament of so many European landscapes, both insular and continental, the Calvinistic bodies, refusing in some instances to apply the word Church to any material structure, built non-descript meeting-houses, without steeples, and with windows so contracted and multiplied, that the *tout ensemble* bore no slight resemblance to the doubled and even tripled port-holes of war-vessels. If not among the German Reformed communities, yet among the founders of some of the North-eastern Colonies, musical instruments in public worship, not excepting the sublime organ, were held in utter abhorrence; all instrumental display, even on week-days, being by statute

restricted to the drum, trumpet, and jewsharp ! Liturgies and forms of devotion were not only condemned, but prohibited under pains and penalties ; two merchants of Salem suffering banishment for merely using in private the Book of Common Prayer ! Chanting was a grievous abomination ; while even the Holy Bible itself, the recorded revelation of our merciful Father in Heaven to a benighted and lost world, was, for many years after the landing at Plymouth Rock, not read at all in any places of common assemblage ! Nor did the Apostolic ministry, in three Orders, which had existed throughout Christendom for fifteen centuries, escape the devastating hands of these radical revolutionists ; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons being supplanted by Pastors, Preachers, and Ruling Elders.

A storm so violent and extreme could not easily abate and cease at once. Though the stern men, who, with the wand of misrepresentation had raised the hurricane, gradually disappeared from the exciting scene of the uncompromising conflict, their quarrels still lived in the inherited prejudices and prepossessions of their descendants. But in this unnatural and hurtful contest, the children could not feel the interest their fathers cherished. They would naturally ask themselves, Why must we do perpetual violence to the declarations of Scripture, to the teachings of history, to the demands of the inherent principles of good taste, to the requirements of an advancing civilization, and to the unsatisfied wants of our moral and religious natures ? These searching questions, arising secretly in the minds of thousands, in spite of the oft-repeated and threadbare story of wrongs inflicted by the wicked Church of England, and of the corruptions in her doctrines and ritual, could, in reflecting and candid breasts, receive but one answer. The individuals who were thus self-interrogated, did not consider themselves bound to prolong a controversy, which, apart from its political connections, was always unwarranted, unreasonable, and unchristian. The contending elements excited by Calvin and his cotemporaries and successors, would, of necessity, at length subside. Reason would at last resume its sway in the hearts of whole communities in which was flowing the blood of the original combatants, and meek-eyed Christian charity would venture to lift her placid and approving face from the midst of the breaking clouds and departing tempests. The living tide of inquiry and feeling began to flow strongly in the opposite direction ; while thither it is now tending with a steadiness and an increasing force which require to be wisely and carefully guided, lest they bear the changed multitudes who are embarked upon the moving surface far

beyond the barriers, which, with a judicious moderation, inspired by the Spirit of God, the Church of England reared against the deep and widespread floods of mediævalism and perverted Christianity.

For a long time have we observed unmistakable indications of a disposition to return to the positions the first Calvinists generally deserted. The process of approach has, with different degrees of rapidity, been going on with growing conspicuousness for the last fifty years and more. Perhaps the first step was the restoration of the public reading of the Scriptures; then, the introduction of instrumental music into the religious services; next, the tolerance, if not the adoption, of clerical vestments; then, the practice of chanting; next, the erection of churches in the most impressive style of architecture; then, to our no small surprise, the publication, in various leading periodicals, both European and American, of suggestions and arguments in favor of Liturgical Worship; while now, after repeated announcements of its appearance, we actually have, to our great satisfaction and joy, a thick and beautifully printed large duodecimo volume of over four hundred pages, bearing the gratifying title which we have prefixed to this Article.

Although their names do not appear in the book, its framers and compilers are, as we learn, the Rev. Drs. Schaff, Nevin, Zacharias, Heiner, and Gerhart, (President of Franklin and Marshall College,) Prof. Porter and Rev. Mr. Harbaugh; being a majority of a Committee of twelve members, raised some seven years since by the Eastern and Western Synods of the German Reformed Church, (a branch of the Palatine Church, founded in the South of Germany during the latter half of the sixteenth century by the adherents of Calvin and introduced into these United States a little more than a hundred years ago,) with the acquiescence of all the Classes. This proposed Liturgy is the result of the combined and protracted labors of these learned, pious, and distinguished men. We call this Liturgy "proposed," because it has not received ecclesiastical sanction, and therefore, as yet, possesses no authority whatever, either as a ritual, or as a body of Christian doctrine.

We, however, hail, and, as we think, not without reason, the appearance of the volume, even in its unauthorized form. We would congratulate, not only the Committee, but the Synods and Classes appointing them, that they have had the moral courage to disregard the violent storm of popular contempt and ridicule which is so generally poured upon all forms of devotion. For more than three centuries have the Church

of England and her branches breasted this pelting and unmeasured tempest; the frightful thunder accompanying the rushing descent incessantly conveying to our ears such utterances as these: "Prescribed words deaden piety; Precomposed prayers extinguish spirituality; A Liturgy consumes the life of religion; A form destroys the power of godliness." It requires a fearless mind and a stout heart to stand this deafening roar, and to assert in its midst, with a voice which mingling with the pervading outcry, may, for a time, prove a whisper scarcely audible, that just the contrary is the fact; that, in the language of Dr. Claudius Buchanan, the unalterable truth of which the experience of the Christian world is constantly demonstrating, and, more and more, "Wo is on the Church which has not a Scriptural Liturgy." This noble spirit of fearlessness the members of the German Reformed Communion now exhibit. If they once joined in the common tirade against devotional formularies, they will do so no longer, but are now giving their public and decided testimony in favor of the position, we as a Church, have, through reproach, opposition, and persecution, been strengthened of God to occupy, for so many generations. With our hearty congratulations for this exhibition and this testimony, we are, on their account, likewise glad and thankful.

As the users, advocates, and defenders of Liturgies, we have always maintained that they have these marked advantages over all extemporaneous methods.

Liturgies, when Scriptural, secure doctrinal correctness. This they do in two principal ways: by presenting to the minds of both ministers and people sound standards of doctrine, and by incorporating these standards into the devotional habits, the religious affections, and the Christian life and experience of every devout worshiper. As a conservator of the truth as it is in Jesus, this incorporating power inherent in the habitual use of a Scriptural Liturgy, cannot be too highly estimated, nor too sedulously employed. It is this power which gives to the Book of Common Prayer an influence, which, to careless observers, seems unaccountable and almost magical. What has kept the Protestant Episcopal Church for more than three hundred years where she is, although she has been all along assailed by every sort of heresy as well within as without? Have her Thirty-Nine Articles been her preservers? No! not these, but her Morning and Evening Prayer, her Litany, her Collects, her Baptismal, Communion, and Burial Services. By the constant use of these forms the truths of the Gospel grow into our spiritual life, as the food we

eat when digested and assimilated incorporates itself with our animal frames. The Westminster Divines prepared a Catechism and Confession of Faith which fill a large volume; but as they were never used as devotional forms, were never prayed, and consequently never embodied in the inner life, they have failed both in Europe and in this country to preserve the Presbyterian denomination from sad departures from the pure Gospel; for out of the soil of this very Westminster divinity have sprung and grown the pestilent fungi of revived Pelagianism and Socinianism, Unitarianism, Universalism, Transcendentalism, Rationalism, Spiritualism, and Pantheism. Thus, the problem has both on the sides of the Liturgists and Anti-liturgists been thoroughly worked out; the experiment has by both been fully tried, with these opposite, palpable, and instructive results. The Liturgy of the English Church has preserved the Faith intact and unhurt; doctrinal standards, which are not devotional, have signally failed to accomplish the very purpose for which they were established.

While a Scriptural Liturgy thus secures doctrinal soundness, it at the same time prevents the introduction of religious error. A correct Liturgy is an impenetrable and insurmountable wall of solid rock against all heretical innovations. More effectual than the huge walls the Romans and Chinese built to bar out their invading neighbors, a Liturgy, composed of the gems and diamonds, and other precious stones of Scripture, always proves itself a defense too hard to be pierced, and too high to be overleaped by the enemies of Christianity in its integrity. This commendatory excellence can a Scriptural Liturgy likewise most truly claim for itself. It furnishes divine models of heart religion, showing us not merely what we are to believe, but also how we are to feel, how we are to pray, and how we are to live, would we be the spiritual disciples of our Lord Jesus Christ. In this way, a Liturgy is not only the pattern, but likewise the mould of the Christian character, and for this reason, Scriptural forms, instead of hindering, as is so commonly and stiffly maintained, actually aid, inspire, and increase devotion; instead of retarding and dwarfing, they positively and largely promote growth in grace, and conformity to the perfect image of Christ.

Scriptural and prescribed Liturgies possess still another preëminent advantage; a paramount excellence which does not command the attention it deserves. Liturgies enrich the *people* with doctrinal and devotional treasures of which the ministers cannot deprive them. When in public Worship, the prayers are *made* at the time by the ministers, they of course

make them precisely as they please. The prayers may be good and suitable, or they may be otherwise, just according to the degree of wisdom and piety their framers possess ; while the people have nothing they can truly call their own. They have no control whatever over their own devotions. They must pray, if they pray at all, just as they are led, but never knowing where they may be conducted ; whether into the safe and refreshing paths of revealed truth, or into the dangerous and hurtful avenues of human speculation, emotional fanaticism, and religious error. On the extemporary plan, the people are necessarily mere passive recipients. It may startle them, (and we hope it will, for when they see their subjection, we may expect they will emancipate themselves from it,) to be told that they are the mere intellectual and moral slaves and tools of the men whom they call their pastors. These may be very excellent and trustworthy masters ; yet the listener to free prayer cannot choose the path either of thought or feeling into which he is taken. He has no will in the matter, except mental dissent, which, on account of his imperfect knowledge of the Gospel, and the reverence with which he regards the Clerical Office, he will not often be likely to exercise ; and accordingly, he becomes the unconscious victim of an irresponsible spiritual despotism.

Is this strong language ? No stronger than the melancholy and abounding facts in the case warrant. Who that considers the actual position of all the congregations where they have no voice in the devotions, can deny that the people are in belief, and feeling, and, of course, in religious character and life, just what the ministers make them ? We have in our minds an instance in point, which has passed before our own eyes within a few years, and we have no doubt, our readers will call to their recollection not a few similar instances. A neighbor of ours was settled as an orthodox minister over an orthodox congregation, which had been so from the first establishment of the colony. The minister, however, gradually slid into Arianism, and then to more decided Unitarianism ; while his immediate successor, going still farther, denied the inspiration of the Old Testament Scriptures, and the utility of the Sacraments ; the deluded people all the while believing as the ministers believed, and swallowing the poisonous food of heresy, with the same passive avidity with which they had once eaten the true bread of eternal life !

True, indeed, people may be entirely willing to be thus imposed upon ; but their willingness does not alter the painful fact that they are. They may even exult in their condition,

and pronounce it religious freedom; still it is slavery, and this of the worst sort, notwithstanding. They may gloss over the subject as much as they please, they may give to the oppressive and ruinous imposition names both gentle, elegant, and popular, but after all the undeniable and distressing fact remains, that the people pray, not as they choose, but exactly and only as the autocrat of the time chooses.

Far different is it with the layman, who in the sanctuary uses devotional forms prepared beforehand. He can, if he will, examine them, compare them with the Bible and the ritual of the Early Church, and see whether or not they are Scriptural and primitive; and having given them his approbation, and adopted them as his guides, he knows, before he begins to pray, the exact nature of the prayers he is to offer. They are now his, as his house and land are his, and no Minister, whether Deacon, Priest, or Bishop, can rob him of his devotional possessions. Himself, and not the Minister, is the master of his own words, thoughts, and desires. He ceases to be another's slave to pray only as he is dictated to, but prays as he prefers, no man, cleric or lay, either hindering or preventing.

Could this whole subject of spiritual subjection which is imposed upon them by their Pastors, and to which they patiently submit, be clearly seen in its true light by the laity of the non-liturgical bodies, they would at once deliver themselves from the grievous and injurious bondage. They would break the heavy yoke of their bondage, as our fathers sundere the galling fetters in which the government of Great Britain had bound them, and declare themselves the Lord's freemen to stand fast in the precious liberty wherewith He has made us free.

These several considerations, recommending liturgical worship, having constrained, as it is pleasant to believe, the Synods of the "German Reformed Church" to desire a Liturgy, we gladly and affectionately welcome them to the position they have chosen among the friends and advocates of prescript services in our approaches to the throne of God.

We are well aware that we are now about to touch upon a very grave and difficult subject, and that we may be altogether too sanguine in our expectations; still we cannot refrain indulging and expressing the hope, that this decided movement towards us, shown not merely in preparing a Liturgy, but likewise in modeling it so closely after our own, may soon result in the establishment of perfect ecclesiastical unity between ourselves and the German Reformed body. Accord-

ing to the sagacious prediction of Bishop Hobart, they have approximated towards us in all essential points, save that of the Ministry. In doctrine we can discover nothing that ought longer to separate us. Having come thus far, and having expressed, in this book and in their other publications, as certainly some members of the Committee have, desires for union with all Christians who hold the true faith, will they not now approach still nearer, and obtain the genuine Episcopacy?

We have not now room even to suggest the way. The practical assent to this important question can be given only by the two Communions which we desire to see united, and the time for this assent may not have arrived. May our gracious Lord, who Himself prays that His people may be one, hasten the happy day, by inspiring all our hearts with brotherly love. We are painfully conscious that our hopes and desires for Christian unity overleap the high and rigid barriers of national descent, denominational preferences, and sectional prejudices, which at present divide Christendom into estranged, repulsive, jealous, and often hostile parties; but we are certain we are carried there by the charity which Christ inspires, and if our Christian feelings cannot now be gratified, if we cannot in this life be permitted to worship and commune with our Christian brethren everywhere, we can, we are sure, without sin against God, and we trust without offense to men, wish and pray for a consummation so evangelical and desirable. If we cannot have these inestimable privileges actually, we will try to have them in spirit, looking for the glorious hour when our LORD's people of all names, nationalities, and countries will sit down together in harmony and love at His marriage Supper in His heavenly Kingdom.

But our readers may expect a more definite insight into the character of this proposed Liturgy than they have yet had. In our limited space we can gratify them only partially. Would they understand the volume thoroughly, they must examine it for themselves. Its general design will be seen from this table of Contents:—Christian Worship; Primitive Forms; The Church Year; The Lord's Day: Festival Seasons: The Holy Communion; Holy Baptism; Confirmation; Marriage; Visitation of the Sick; Ordination and Installation; Excommunication and Restoration; Laying of a Corner Stone; Consecration of a Church; Consecration of a Burial Ground; Reception of Immigrants; Burial of the Dead; Family Prayers; Guide to Private Devotion; Psalms and Hymns.

With such a multiplicity of subjects before us, each of which furnishes material for a separate treatise, we cannot descend to very minute particulars; while in attempting to describe its general character, we must assume some standpoint, from which to direct our observations; and as Churchmen, what other ground of comparison can we consistently occupy than that taken by this German Reformed Committee themselves, and furnished by our own Book of Common Prayer.

The Prayer Book of the Church of England, and of her daughter in this country, is the recorded expression of the Church's conscious life for the last three centuries, and, indeed, for a period extending back into the remote past, almost, if not quite, to the times of the Apostles themselves. In the Confessions, Creeds, Prayers, Supplications, and Thanksgivings, we have then the Church's application to her own condition and wants, of the truths and grace of the Gospel itself. The Church having learned the Gospel, and received its gracious influences, confessed, prayed, supplicated, and praised, as she was prompted by her renewed feelings and the circumstances in which she was from time to time placed.

For this reason our Liturgy is the invaluable record of the Church's inward experience; is an outward manifestation from this deep source; is a living offshoot from this interior root. Some ten generations of Christians have already used our Liturgy very much in its present form, while not less than thirty additional generations of Christ's people have repeated as their habitual devotions the more ancient portions. What do we now discover respecting our Liturgical Services? What but this? They have received the approbation and love of at least *forty* generations of the followers of the LAMB; and they were thus approved, loved, and habitually used, because of their exact correspondence with the Christian consciousness of these innumerable disciples, and fully met and satisfied their spiritual wants. By this process, our Liturgy is the work, not so much of the learned and devout Bishops and other Ministers, who were instrumental in embodying it, and giving it permanent existence, as the elaborated production of the pious Laity; of the contrite, believing, and praying men and women, who have successively lived and been conformed to our Lord's image during the onward flow of a decade and a half of centuries. As this ever-moving tide rolled on, the materials of which the Liturgy was composed were experiencing contact, attrition, polish, and decomposition; like the process described by Geologists,

when masses of rock detached from some Northern mountain were borne forward towards the equator by migrating glaciers and overflowing oceans, and deposited along the surface of the earth, in the shape of boulders and smoothly rounded stones. By this pulverizing operation, to which our Liturgy has for so long a space of time been subjected, whatever in its composition is soft and pliable must have disappeared; while its present component parts must be of the nature of the stone struck from "the mountain not made with hands."

Thus produced, and wrought out by the minds and hearts of so many generations, our Liturgy must have excellencies which no other can possibly possess; because no other is equally old, no other has submitted to such a searching process of rough contact, crushing attrition, incessant polish, and destructive decomposition. Our Liturgy is emphatically and peculiarly a tried and approved work. It was tried and approved, when the enthroned Cæsars darted the lightnings of their power from the banks of the Tiber. It was tried and approved, when the Northern hordes overran and swallowed up the Roman Empire. It was tried and approved, when the victorious Charlemagne laid the foundations of the modern European dynasties. It was tried and approved, when from the heaving crusts of hardened mediævalism there reappeared at the Reformation the fair creations of Primitive Christianity. Our Liturgy has been prayed, not only in Churches, and under roofs of all conceivable structure, and by Christians of different and remote nations, and of all conditions, colors, and characters, but by the sea-side, and on ship decks, in prisons and dungeons, in secret catacombs, and at the martyr's stake. Our Liturgy has been lisped by infancy, imparted strength for the trials and conflicts of manhood, given support to old age, and furnished chariots of fire for departing souls to ascend and meet Moses and Elijah in glory.

Viewing from this exclusive vantage ground of our own venerable and thoroughly tested formularies, the diversified production of Doctors Nevins and Schaff and their associates, we perceive, that what we so preëminently have, it has not, except so far as it embodies selections from the ancient Liturgies. This German Reformed Book has not been tried; although we most sincerely hope it will be. It has not been subjected to the sifting and disintegrating test of actual use. The book was compiled and made in the closet; or rather the compilers and makers supposed themselves in their pulpits, there preparing such devotions as they judged it would be

proper for the people to hear, and to unite in, to a small extent. In consequence, the whole production has a closet, pulpit, ministerial, artificial aspect and character. *It has never been down among the pews.* It has never been on the lips of the people. It has never found a place in their judgments and affections. It has never approved itself to their religious sense, and for this reason lacks the life of reality, and seems like a wreath of muslin flowers, or the collections of an herbarium, without fragrance and the glow of beauty.

We do not blame the compilers and composers for these defects in their ritual, although we cannot but think that in the original compositions they had done better to have more closely imitated the simplicity, conciseness, and Anglo-Saxon purity and brevity of our own Liturgy; since, of course, this new manual must be prepared, before it could be used. Still, we are constrained to express the opinion, that if at one or more of their numerous meetings, towards ninety in all, the Committee had placed one of their number in front of the pulpit, and the rest constituted a congregation, and performed the Services responsively, they would have seen, that to some extent, to say no more, the results of their protracted labor are wholly impracticable; and consequent upon this important discovery, they would have made not a few alterations, omissions, and also additions.

Sitting then in the pew with our German Reformed brethren, for there is the place to test every Liturgy, we will now venture to express our humble judgment respecting their work, both as a whole, and in its several parts. We will first mention some things, which we are exceedingly sorry to see omitted. We deeply regret to find so few responses from the Congregation; and also that the Psalter, or Psalms of David, is, as a continuous whole, totally discarded. We are surprised at this. Our Lord and His Apostles, and the Primitive Church, used the Psalms; and shall not we? Indeed, is not their use rendered obligatory by this language of St. Paul, "Speaking to yourselves, and admonishing one another *in Psalms?*"

Two other omissions strike us painfully; to wit: of Epistles and Gospels for Passion-Week; and of Tables of Lessons of Holy Scripture, to be used at Morning and Evening Prayer throughout the Year. These omissions, particularly the latter, we must regard as radical and insufferable. To be sure, a place is furnished in the Services for the reading of a single portion of Scripture, but as even its selection is left to the discretion of the minister, and therefore of course

oftentimes to his ignorance and indifference, this summary and random use of the Bible can never be an adequate substitute for our own admirably harmonized, instructive, and edifying system of extended readings from the Old and New Testaments.

Scarcely possible is it, to give in our Christian assemblies undue prominence to God's own voice speaking to us through Patriarchs and Prophets, Evangelists and Apostles. Better have no sermon whatever, least of all forty minutes long, the preaching-time allowed in this Liturgy, than to omit the deliberate and impressive reading of fixed selections from *both* Testaments, the Old as well as the New; for as the matter now stands in this German Reformed Book, the Old Testament, with its monitory history, its foreshadowing types, and its far-seeing prophecies, may be in the sanctuary, neglected and ignored altogether.

There are denominations, the Baptists particularly, whose doctrinal interest it is, to disparage, as did the Manicheans of the early centuries of our era, the Dispensation antecedent to the Gospel; and for this cause, we ought never to forget, that when our LORD says, "Search the Scriptures," His sovereign command embraces, to use His own summary of the inspired books then extant, "the Law of Moses, the Prophets, and the Psalms;" and we should in our Churches prescribe and read accordingly. The high prominence given by the Protestant Episcopal Church to the public reading of Holy Scripture, is her peculiar glory, and renders her the bulwark of the truth as it is in Jesus; and we cannot but be sensibly pained, whenever by any denomination her practice, in this respect, is not fully adopted.

No reason is assigned by our Mercersburg brethren, nor can we see any, why St. Stephen, St. John, and the Holy Innocents are to receive exclusive commemoration. Either commemorate, we should say, all the Apostles, or none at all.

When we opened this new Liturgy, we expected to see a literal compliance with our LORD's command, "Pray ye the Lord of the harvest that he may send forth laborers into his harvest." But in this expectation we are disappointed; the authors having failed to supply an omission which has so long characterized our own Formularies.

As a whole, this Proposed Liturgy, while it has many excellencies, strikes us as being heavily overloaded. Most of the Introductory Sentences of Scripture seem to us quite superfluous; inasmuch as they afterwards appear in various connections. In the Church Year, we are unable to see the reason

for calling the last six months *Church Seasons*. Were not the preceding ones also Church? and if so, those thus called are not, in distinction from the rest. The division is tautological and superfluous. Something more like our own would be better. Why, we ask, are Latin titles given to six Sundays of the Easter (part of our Lent) Season? As names, they are unnecessary, since each Sunday has another. A Note says, that these are "the initial words in the service of the Latin Church;" but as the Introits of the Roman Missal are not inserted in this German Reformed Liturgy, why have the titles? or, if for six Sundays, why not for fifty-two? Are these outlandish scraps of Latin an indulgence to the taste of one or two members of the Committee?

It is easy to perceive, that this encumbered work is the production of different authors, as the faults which we are surprised to find, abound on certain pages, while other portions are quite free from blemishes. But few of our own Collects are retained entire; some are diluted for the worse, since they are deprived of the brevity, compactness, strength, and comprehensiveness, both of the original Latin, and of our own inimitable Anglo-Saxon version; while the new Collects are generally diffuse and long, and in some instances marred by obscure expressions, cant phrases, and language which is too rhetorical for the simplicity that should ever characterize prayer. In the Collects, we also have slight indications of attempts to teach and exhort, as well as to pray; indications which become conspicuous and abundant in some of the other Services, particularly in the prayers for the special seasons.

With the exception of the first, the four regular Services for Sunday, bear little or no resemblance to our Liturgy, but are throughout Presbyterian in their construction; although portions of the language are taken from our Prayer Book. As collections of Christian truth, as comprehensive, appropriate, and fervent petitions, and as literary compositions, devoid of the usual blemishes which frequently characterize extemporaneous effusions, these Sunday Services deserve to be examined; and yet with their many excellencies, they contain very little that is not either in our Litany, or in our longer prayers, which, if necessity requires, can be used without responses, and therefore before people who are not acquainted with our forms.

The Prayers for the Festival Seasons, among which is ranked *Good Friday*, (?) constitute perhaps the most faulty portion of the volume. The Canticles are not as they ought to be, exclusively in the language of Scripture, and the immoderate length of the sentences unfits them for responsive use. How

short are the parallelisms of the Psalms in the Bible! We cannot improve this divine model. It is founded in the nature of the human mind.

Similar objections may be urged against the Prayers. Most of them are quite too long; as it may be justly doubted, whether intensity of devotional feeling can be sustained for the length of time required. In most minds, prayer, even that which is truly Christian, is too feeble a bird, to stop and hover on the wing, in order to listen to a homily, even though in the very words of Scripture itself. What each praying soul wants is a short and rapid flight upward to the throne of Grace. If the voyage is protracted, the spirit of devotion will flag, tire, and fall.

Many of these Festival effusions are, moreover, overloaded with declarations and exhortations, neither of which should have place in prayers; while occasionally, there is a figurative expression which is obscure, as, "Give us the wings of the morning;" and also a class of phrases, which in devotion contrast harshly with the consecrated words of our English Bible; as, "Immediate prospect, living sense," (can there be sense which is not living?) "creative energy, glad shores, and peace-speaking."

In the Eucharistic and Baptismal Services, in which we can detect nothing contrary to our own standards, but only the faith of all the early Reformers of whatever name, as one can see for himself by consulting Hall's Harmony of Confessions, we think we recognize the mind and heart of one, to whom the Church everywhere is under lasting obligations for his masterly and timely treatise on the Mystical Presence.

The Service for Confirmation will be likely to attract no little attention in our Church, as the Preface will raise several inquiries about our own. It is most gratifying to us to know how extensively the laying on of hands is practised by our German Reformed and Lutheran brethren. The last General Synod of the "Evangelical Lutheran Church," reports not less than *fourteen thousand and six hundred* persons confirmed during the two preceding years; or at the rate of seven thousand and three hundred annually. If the Confirmations in the German Reformed are in the same proportion, they were last year half this number; making the aggregate of the two over *ten thousand*; while with ourselves, the average of annual Confirmations for the three years ending October, 1856, was *twenty-two thousand and four hundred*. At this time our clergy are eighteen hundred; those of the two denominations of which we are speaking, one thousand. If our data are cor-

rect, we thus perceive that their confirmations are to ours in the proportion of ten to twelve; a fact which we may presume will be new as well as gratifying to many of our readers.

With the Congregational Episcopacy of this German Reformed Manual we cannot agree, so long as it is certain that James, the first Bishop of Jerusalem, had under his care in that city alone, tens of thousands of Christians; as appears from the Greek of Acts xxi, 20; and that there is not the slightest Scriptural difference between a preaching and a ruling Elder; as is evident from comparing Acts xx, 28, with 1 Tim. v, 17.

Our brethren who have not an Episcopacy extending over several congregations, or a diocese, know not how much they in consequence lose in sympathy, harmony, union, and strength. A body without a head is an anomaly we see nowhere else but in the denominations who have separated from the Episcopacy which was universally in the Christian Church for the first fifteen centuries of its existence. Every animal body, every state, every army, every college, every society, every corporation has its head. Every city, with the surrounding region, should have its ecclesiastical head. So it was in the days of Apostolic Order; and so it will be once more, when Primitive Order shall be again thoroughly restored to the rent and enfeebled Church of CHRIST.

There are some things in the remarkable book we are noticing, which, with modifications, we should like to have incorporated in our own system; as the Services for Excommunication and Restoration, Laying of a Corner Stone, Consecration of a Burial Ground, Reception of Immigrants, and Guide to Private Devotion.

As we have already intimated, this elaborate Liturgy suffers greatly from not having passed the ordeal of experience, and also from being the production of men who have always been accustomed to extemporaneous modes of worship. They could not unlearn themselves at once. Should the book ever undergo a careful revision by another Committee, who would not be influenced in their judgments and tastes by paternal blindness and partiality, no doubt many needed and important omissions and alterations, as well as additions and improvements, would be the result. Indeed, were we members of the German Reformed body, we should consider it very unwise to adopt this Liturgy in its present state. A very promising beginning has been made. Valuable materials have been collected. Suggestive, rather than perfect, specimens have been produced. Will the beginning be the end of

this noble movement in the right direction? We most sincerely trust not. We shall wait with earnest hope to see it continued, and more exquisitely matured; being very sure that whenever the cold glaciers of liturgical indifference and dread, now resting, as we conclude, upon a portion, at least, of the Palatine brotherhood shall break up and roll forward on the floods of actual use, many a piece of soft clay, in the shape of phrases, either bombastic, (as at the close of the form for consecrating a burial ground,) ambitious, or cant, will wholly vanish; while the harder substances, which will continue to be borne along, becoming consolidated and attrite, will resemble the compact, polished, and imperishable rock of our own ancient, tasteful, and refined formularies, and be fit for permanent incorporation into the revised book.

ART. IV.—PARTON'S LIFE OF AARON BURR.

The Life and Times of Aaron Burr, Lieutenant Colonel in the army of the Revolution, United States Senator, Vice President of the United States, &c. By J. PARTON, author of "Humorous Poetry of the English Language," "Life of Horace Greeley," &c.

WITH the motives for writing Biography, and with the literary ability, the truthfulness, and the amount of research, with which the work is accomplished, we, as Religious Journalists, have ordinarily nothing to do. We do not therefore place at the head of this Article the title of Parton's Life of Aaron Burr, with any intention either of giving a critical review of the work, or of entering into the exciting controversy in respect to the real character of Burr, which the publication of the book has called forth in the public prints.

That Mr. Parton has produced an exceedingly interesting book, is beyond a question; whether he succeeds in accomplishing the Herculean task of satisfying the public mind that Aaron Burr was, after all, no worse than other men, a real *human man*, and no demon, erring, indeed, like other mortals, but upon the whole, "more sinned against than sinning," is a question which time must determine; we can only say that if he does, he will have refuted, in a remarkable manner, the political axiom, that "the unanimous verdict of the whole people is always right," for certainly no man ever acquired for himself, unjustly, a reputation, both public and private, more universally and utterly execrated. There are points of view, however, in which the Biography of any man, distinguished above his fellows, either for talents, virtue, vice, or success in life, becomes both a legitimate and an important subject for consideration in our columns. Biography, in its character of History individualized, appeals directly to the most influential principles of our nature; man feels intuitively the bond of human relationship to each individual man, and in all truthful or truth-like delineations of individual action, or character, we are irresistibly drawn, by the very constitution of our nature, to sympathize with, imitate, or emulate the conduct which we admire, and to disapprove, disown, and avoid that which is distasteful to us; it must ever be, then, one of the first duties

of Church Journalism to reprove, with unsparing severity, all efforts in Biography to excuse vice, in any form, or to palliate, or soften down its disgusting features; and it must equally be its imperative duty to deduce, from the hard earned experiences of others, practical lessons of instruction, and to enforce such lessons upon the minds of the young, by that most convincing of all arguments to the youthful mind, the *argumentum ad hominem*.

With such intentions, we propose now to consider this Biography of Aaron Burr; and in our remarks we shall endeavor to treat the Author, in the criticism which we may feel called upon to make concerning him, with perfect fairness; we shall receive as true his narration of the incidents of Burr's life, drawing our lessons of instruction from the character and conduct of Burr, as represented in, or deducible from, this Biography; we shall also take it for granted that our readers have already perused the book, and shall not, therefore, occupy space and time unnecessarily, in a resumé of its historical incidents.

The death of both of the parents of Burr, in his infancy,—a calamity always great to any well born child,—was doubly great to a boy endowed with the indomitable will, the clear, cool, and almost intuitive intellect, and the strong susceptibility to family ties, ascribed to Burr.

Ushered, by his birth, into the stern embrace of Puritanism, called upon and expected to emulate and imitate the example, and embrace the faith of a long line of Puritan ancestors, Pastors of the Puritan fold, and orthodox in its creed, and by the death of his parents deprived of a mother's love and a father's care, which might have mellowed down the harsh and repellant features of the system, his ancestral distinction became to him a positive evil.

We would not deal harshly with the religious system which shaped the faith of our own early life, or refrain from awarding to it such meed of praise as its merits may justly claim. The awful thunders of the Law, and the tender appeals of the Gospel, are both proclaimed by God to his sin-inheriting and sin-practicing creatures, and both must, therefore, hold their *due* place in the teachings of the Christian Pastor to his flock. The stirring appeals to the fears of sinning souls, the terrific delineations of the horrors of the judgment and eternal perdition, and the simple, single, alternative of obedience or damnation, which have ever formed the great burden of the Puritan teaching, beyond all question, have aroused the conscience of many a case-hardened sinner, and driven him into the ranks of the true followers of Christ. They are legitimate

weapons in the militant state of the Church; the meat to be dealt out to the strong men-combatants with whom she has to deal. But there is also—thanks be to God that such is the fact—a “milk for the babes” of the great army of God’s unconverted creatures, for the “babes” in years, and “babes” in character; for the loving cherubs whom our blessed Saviour tenderly took in his arms and said “of such are the Kingdom of Heaven,” and for the tender-hearted, honest and anxiously enquiring men and women, who are earnestly seeking the Kingdom of Heaven. This Gospel food, consisting of the great revealed facts that “*God is love*,” and that it was “for the love wherewith he loved us that Christ gave himself a propitiation for our sins,” is by the stern, unbending system of Puritanism, wrongfully thrust into the far off, shadowy distance, and only faintly depicted as a bright spot dimly seen in the distant perspective. The Law and its penalty, obedience or damnation—predestination of individual souls to eternal misery—these, in bold outline, ever form the great prominent features of their ecclesiastical picture.

This system would seem, from our Author, to have been thoroughly, but most disastrously, tried upon young Burr, by the reverend relative who had charge of his boyhood, and afterwards, during his College life, by others of his family friends, and the Professors of the College, and the lamentable effects produced by it are strikingly, though tersely, portrayed by Mr. Parton.

Not long after his College life had ended, Burr, a youth in years, but precocious in intellect, entered upon his opening manhood just at a time when the stirring events, immediately preceding the commencement of our Revolution, and an awakening perception of the existence of those great fundamental political rights which that Revolution established, were calling into exercise the whole mental forces of a race of men unexampled in the history of the world; and at a time, too, when the brilliant sophistries, and rationalistic infidel speculations of Voltaire, and other French free thinkers, and the intense, but gentlemanly and attractive selfishness of the Chesterfieldian school were exerting the full force of their powers upon the now awakening intellect of universal humanity.

It was doubtless because he had become deeply imbued with sophistical rationalism, rather than from any compunctions of an aroused conscience, as supposed by our Author, that he now resolved, “instead of subjecting *himself to be tried* by the theology of the day, *to try it*.” Placing himself for

this purpose under an eminent Puritan minister, he satisfactorily to himself, employed against his teacher, in their doctrinal discussions, the arguments which had captivated his own mind; and, finding them unanswered, he presumed them to be unanswerable; and therefore he "rejected the *Gospel according to Jonathan Edwards*; rejected it, as he always maintained, after a calm and full investigation; rejected it completely and forever." It is sad to think that, had *the Gospel according to Christ and his Apostles*, with its love for all, and its salvation for all who will embrace it, been then presented to, and judiciously enforced upon him, "the truth as it is in Jesus" might, by the blessing of God, have overcome his predetermined skepticism, and the name of Aaron Burr might have illumined the page of history, as a great and shining light in the Church of Christ, or as a statesman whose wisdom and virtue add dignity to the race of man.

That Burr was sincere in the skepticism thus adopted by him, that he honestly believed that he had duly examined, and justly rejected the claims of religion upon his faith and practice, we may well admit. Few men are ever otherwise than sincere, even when maintaining the grossest errors, and were it the fact that mere sincerity excused errors, either of faith or action, seldom would the acts of man, however atrocious, constitute crime; but such is not the case either in human or Divine jurisprudence. The due use of *all available means* to learn the truth must accompany sincerity in the search for it, or error will result in the case with as much certainty as that false conclusions will follow from false premises. Burr exhibited in this transaction a trait of character conspicuous in his after life; he sought a victory, and claimed to have obtained it by superior strategy. By assuming the position of assault, and raising a "side issue," for controversy, he avoided a trial of his own state, kept out of sight the questions of fundamental importance in the case, and satisfied his conscience when he deemed he had demonstrated *that a sect of Christians held untenable doctrines of faith*. Whether he really had the best of the argument, in this controversy with his clerical preceptor, our Author does not give us the means to determine; but that a conclusion arrived at in a controversy so conducted should have satisfied the acute mind of *any young man*, and especially that it should have served for a lifetime as the well settled creed of a man like Burr, is truly astonishing, and can only be accounted for by supposing that judgment had already been rendered subservient to desire; that what he wished he willed, and what he willed he

believed. That he was already dissolute in his habits is quite apparent from his Biography, the disclaimer of Mr. Parton to the contrary notwithstanding, and that from thenceforth he became, and ever after continued, debauched in morals, and guided and controlled by the single principle of selfishness, his whole after life conclusively demonstrates.

He embarks in life at the most exciting period of our history, with a courage which knew no fear, a perseverance which knew no discouragement, a mind well stored with the treasures of literature, the courteous manners of a polished gentleman, a body inured to labor and fatigue, powers of personal fascination seldom equaled, an intellect quick to discern and a will firm to execute; and with a strong family influence to advance his interests, his prospects in life were peculiarly brilliant, and his success was immediate and extraordinary. Joining the army, he deservedly soon gained for himself distinction,—for ambition and patriotism both pointed to the same goal, the support of his country against her oppressors,—and the reputation which he immediately acquired as a daring, efficient, and intelligent officer, attracted the attention, and obtained for him the particular approbation of the Commander-in-Chief.

Unfortunately for him, he was appointed to, and accepted, a post in the military family, and was admitted into the domestic circle of Washington, and was thus brought into immediate contact and intimate personal relations with that great and good man. The result was inevitable. The brilliant qualities of the officer in the stirring scenes of war, might close the eyes of others to the faults of the man, but he was now to deal with one whose sterling virtue instinctively detected, and indignantly recoiled from vice in all its forms and disguises. The connection between them was short and unsatisfactory; the brilliant and useful young officer was needed for the service of his country, and was therefore transferred to another station; but the dissolute man forfeited at once and forever the confidence and esteem of his commander. The conduct of Washington then, and thenceforth, towards him, had and could have but one significance. Sterling virtue and genuine piety could hold no fellowship with, and feel no regard for, dissolute habits and infidel principles; and distinguished as Burr afterwards became at the Bar, and in the Councils of the Nation, to the mind of Washington he always was, and could only be, a vicious man and a dangerous politician.

We feel that the character of "the Father of his Country,"

needs no defense from assaults, open or insidious, from whatever quarter they may come : it stands impregnable upon the firm basis of its own intrinsic merit ; the most brilliant star in the great galaxy of the mighty names which ennoble the race of man and distinguish the age favored by their birth. The pitifully false, and unjust conceptions of his character, exhibited by our Author throughout his book, (like the late silly efforts of another Biographer to filch his laurels and bind them upon the brow of his amanuensis,) can only injure the fame of their author and the book which contains them. No one claims for Washington the reckless daring, the brilliant conceptions, the power of wielding and concentrating mighty masses, and the intense, all-absorbing selfishness (erst denominated by some men "*noble ambition*") which constitute the merits of the *conquering hero*. Jena, Austerlitz, the bridge of Lodi, Marengo, or Waterloo, find no place in the annals of his military life ; they are Napoleonic, not Washingtonian ; and equally so were the base robbery of Spain, and the mad march upon Moscow. But the courage to suffer and endure, the capacity to kindle the ardor and animate with high and lofty motives the souls of an ill-fed and scarcely clad patriot soldiery ; the virtue which could resist the enticements of personal ambition, and reject with scorn the most tempting inducements to sacrifice his Country for selfish ends ; the firmness to persevere *in the path of duty*, calmly resolute to punish, even when his heart was bursting with sympathy for the criminal ; the impressive dignity of character and demeanor, unruffled by bursts of passion, commanding the respect of others and ensuring his own ; in fine, the happy combination of a well balanced judgment and unflinching courage, directing him *when to strike and when to endure* ; these, which constitute the essential qualities of a *Country's Defender*, were eminently Washingtonian, not Napoleonic ; and these, with the distinguished civil abilities which enabled him to put successfully in motion the new political machine, whose perfections mankind are only now beginning to understand and appreciate, have so engrafted the character of Washington into the hearts of his countrymen, that it must pass unscathed through all assaults of ignorance, malevolence, partisan zeal, or misdirected family affection.

That Burr was an able, energetic, and efficient military officer, and that he deservedly acquired the distinguished reputation and rank which crowned his labors, there can be no doubt. The leading traits of his character peculiarly

fitted him for the trade of war; and doubtless his scheming, daring, and stratagetical disposition, must have taken great delight in the success of the well planned surprises which distinguished his career whilst holding an independent command in the army.

Four years before the close of the war, his shattered health compelled him to resign his commission, when, choosing the Law for his profession, he assiduously prepared himself to *practice it with success*. His legal character, as sketched by our Author, at this time of his life, is doubtless eminently just and truthful; *success* was the goal of his ambition, his sole standard of legal merit. With the *philosophy of law*, the great principles of eternal justice upon which it is founded, and to which it appeals, in all cases of unwritten enactment, he cared not to intermeddle.

At the close of the war, in 1783, then a lawyer of some two years' standing, he commenced the practice of his profession in the City of New York, and, favored by peculiar circumstances, almost immediately acquired a high reputation, and an extensive business. Hamilton, about one year his junior in age, was his principal competitor in his profession. In politics, also, he took a leading part, when he had an object to effect, and as he and Hamilton took opposite sides, they were frequently pitted against each other in party strife. A professional and party rivalry thus grew up between them, although their personal relations to each other appear to have been for many years of a friendly character.

The Independence of the Thirteen Colonies had been acknowledged by the Treaty of 1783, and the *quasi* government formed, under the pressing exigencies of the times, by the Articles of Confederation, being found utterly inadequate to produce even the semblance of a consistent nationality, a Convention, elected to amend those Articles, had framed and submitted to the people for ratification, the glorious Constitution which has now, for more than seventy years, challenged the admiration of the world, as the happiest conception of the human mind for the government of a great people.

It is a remarkable circumstance, that, during all the exciting discussion which preceded the adoption of that Constitution, Burr, the rival of Hamilton, and the acknowledged leader in New York of the party opposed to him, should have taken no part in the controversy.

The Constitution being adopted, and having been for twelve years in successful operation, the exciting Presidential election of 1800 approached, and Burr, as the acknowledged

leader of the Democratic (then called Republican) party, in New York, was nominated by that party for the office of Vice President, with Jefferson for President, of the United States, and the time had now arrived when the pernicious principles of Burr were to bear their natural fruit in plunging him into irretrievable ruin. The circumstances of that contest are fully detailed by Mr. Parton. Jefferson and Burr each received an equal number of votes, and by an absurd provision of the Constitution, the House of Representatives was in such case required to elect one of them President. The intention of the framers of the Constitution had been, that the House should elect when a tie occurred in the highest number of votes *cast by the people, for President*, but the words of the Constitution embraced the present case. Burr thoroughly understood, and fully appreciated his position and his duty; and when the probability was first hinted that the Federal party might determine to cast their votes for him, he scouted the idea of such a contest, and declared that he would not be made instrumental in thus thwarting the wishes of the people.

The true wisdom, as well as the honesty of the course of action thus marked out for himself by Burr, is the more apparent, when we consider that the Vice Presidency had, up to that time, been the stepping-stone to the Presidential chair; that by exerting himself to defeat the machinations of his political opponents, he would place his political friends under obligations to him, which would insure his election in another four, or at most, eight years. But the temptation of present possession of power, even at the sacrifice of his own self-respect, as well as the esteem of his political friends, was too tempting a bait to be rejected by a man unrestrained by moral principle, and who knew no motive for action but selfishness.

The contest, and its result, are well known, and Burr, a defeated man, detested by his own party as a political renegade, and abhorred by the Federalists, was as effectually dead to all chance of political preferment as if his body had been mouldering in the tomb.

The exertions of Hamilton, to defeat Burr in this contest, had been unremitting, and had resulted in depriving him of Federal votes which would have insured his election, and Burr returned to New York with the most embittered feelings against his political and legal rival.

The public have long had the means of forming a correct conclusion as to the motives of Burr in forcing upon Hamil-

ton the fatal duel which followed. The correspondence which preceded the meeting was published, and eagerly read by the public, and the labors of our Author, it seems to us, must have the effect to forever establish the justice of the public opinion, then almost universally entertained, that the duel was the result of a deliberate determination of a desperate man to destroy his antagonist, availing himself, for that purpose, of the forms of the "code of honor" to save the deed from its appropriate name, of *deliberate murder, with malice aforethought*. How full of truth and pathos was the exclamation, wrung from him at the close of life, "*Had I read Voltaire less, I should have known that the world was wide enough for Hamilton and me!*"

The Christian public then were, and still continue to be, justly responsible for a large share of the guilt of the absurd practice of dueling. They could then, and can now, eloquently generalize on the subject, condemn the crime in the abstract, and even incorporate into the Statute Book stringent laws for its suppression; but who can point to the felon's death, which practically proves, in an individual case, the actual horror of the public, upon the perpetration of the crime?

Burr was, doubtless, therefore, astonished at the hurricane of public indignation created by his duel, and probably the affair would have speedily passed from the public mind, after the expression of a few generalities of virtuous indignation, had not the victim been the favorite leader of a great party, and the perpetrator a disgraced politician, so bitterly execrated, for his apostasy, that all men were glad of a favorable opportunity to heap maledictions upon his head. The only beneficial result of the duel, and of the excitement produced by it, consisted in the gradual establishment, in the Northern States, of a more healthy state of genuine public sentiment; the awakening of the public consciousness to the utter absurdity of the proposition, that it was the duty of an honorable man to vindicate his fame, when unjustly assailed, by tendering to his base calumniator the opportunity to take away his life also, without thereby incurring the legal responsibility, or the public odium, due to his crime.

Burr was still Vice President, and the respect due to the office gave him some consideration with the public, although his political influence was entirely gone. Accordingly at the following election no voice was raised in favor of continuing him, even in the office which he had held, and much less of promoting him to the Presidency; and to return to his practice in New York was out of the question; no business awaited him in the

Courts there, unless it should be that of defending his own neck from the gallows; his proud, enterprising, and persevering spirit could not endure such a state of existence, and his soldier heart determined, therefore, to carve out a destiny for himself. His celebrated Western expedition was accordingly undertaken. The *real* character of that enterprise may never be discovered; whether he actually meditated *treason* against his own country, by the dismemberment of the Confederacy, or proposed merely the seizure, *with a robber hand*, of the territories of a neighboring power, we leave with his Biographers to determine. The enterprise, let it have been Treason or modern Fillibusterism, was simply the undertaking of a selfish adventurer to advance his own interests, in total disregard of the rights of others; and its signal failure, with his subsequent arrest and trial for Treason, effectually closed to him all avenues to power in America.

The zeal with which our Author rakes up the long buried charges against the character and conduct of President Jefferson, on account of the determined course pursued by him in the arrest and trial of Burr, will probably call forth, from some member of the great Party which Jefferson founded, and which has ever since controlled the destinies of the country, an adequate reply. We would only remark concerning it, that history, written at a time when party passions have had time to cool, should deal cautiously with charges made in the heat of party strife, and especially so when it is canvassing characters whose reputations have become a part of a Nation's glory.

We do not follow Burr in his four years' residence in Europe. His hopes, whatever they may have been, were doomed to meet with mortifying disappointment; but we cannot refrain from sympathizing with the indomitable perseverance of the man who could still hope and strive for assistance in his projects, from Governments which he knew were holding him in surveillance as a dangerous character.

In 1812 he returned to America under a feigned name, and in disguise, but finding that his offenses had so far grown stale in the public mind that he might safely show himself, without incurring the danger of a criminal prosecution, he returned to New York, and once more established himself in the practice of his profession. He was yet in the prime of life, and in the full vigor of mind and body; for more than twenty years, thereafter, he continued in the practice of his profession, but he never, at any time, gained for himself anything more than a precarious subsistence, and generally scarcely that. Our Author attempts to account for this want of success, and, it

seems to us, fails entirely to furnish any satisfactory explanation of it.

Most men, even when *foolish enough* "to go to law," have sense enough to select their counsel to suit their case, and therefore, although the prevalent sentiments in respect to Burr would unquestionably affect the amount of his business, yet it is undoubtedly true that, if he did actually return to his practice with a reputation not only for preëminent ability, but also for *uniform success*, he certainly would have found his table at all times well loaded with briefs, and his pockets well filled with fees.

But the truth is, that Mr. Parton greatly over-estimates the legal reputation with which Burr re-appeared at the Bar, and which he afterwards sustained there. His continued absence from the State for about eight years, and the necessarily serious interruption to his practice during the additional four years of his Vice Presidency, must have deprived him of his familiarity with the practice of the Courts, and made him "rusty in the law."

The Bench was now occupied by some of the ablest minds of any age of the world's history; men who adorned their station as much by the profundity of their learning, as by the giant dimensions of their intellects.

The country, too, had vastly increased in commercial business and importance, and, as a necessary consequence, a new class of business was beginning to occupy a large share of the time of the Courts, business involving the consideration of abstruse questions of commercial law, as received and understood in every civilized nation, and which demanded, therefore, for their elucidation, a familiarity with the adjudications of the civilized world, as well as a thorough understanding and appreciation of the great fundamental principles of right reason, the foundation of *all law*, and most especially of commercial law.

Burr, in the zenith of his professional reputation, never had been esteemed, and from the nature of things could not have been, a *profound* lawyer. His preparatory studies were short, and pursued in the form of colloquial controversy with his teacher, rather than in diligent study of books, and his engrossing practice, together with his political engagements, must have so occupied his time as to prevent anything more than a diligent study of individual cases. He had been a skillful practitioner, an expert in the quirks and quibbles of the law, delighting in the technicalities and fictions of practice, then so prevalent, especially in actions of ejectment:

quick to discern and avail himself of the mistakes of his opponent, as well as to perceive the salient points of his own case, cool and self-possessed in the management of his cause, never disturbed, however much he might be surprised by an unexpected point raised against him, and possessing in a remarkable degree the power of expressing his views in the most terse and forcible language. With such qualifications it is not surprising that his early professional career should have been eminently successful; nor is it wonderful that, on returning to the Bar under the disadvantageous circumstances which we have enumerated, he should have failed to acquire a profitable business, or that he should have gradually lapsed into the position, which he certainly occupied during the later years of his life, of a mere industrious resurrectionist of defunct titles and forgotten claims, to be pursued for the joint benefit of counsel and client.

Of the personal character of Burr, as depicted by our Author, we are yet to speak; and as disinterested Journalists, we cheerfully accede to him all which can be justly claimed in his favor, from the sketches of him, given by his Biographer. His affection for his wife, daughter, and grandchild, are the bright and redeeming traits in the picture of his private life, and no one can fail to sympathize with the genuine human anguish which evidently wrung his soul, when the announcement of the death of his grandchild, and, afterwards, of the loss of his daughter, destroyed his last remaining hope of consolation in his lonely desolation. The enduring personal friendships which he formed, few though they appear to have been in number, and the steady devotion of some of those friends to him, in the darkest days of his adversity, prove incontestibly, not only his capability of feeling for others, but the intensity of affection which he could inspire towards himself.

His absorbing earnestness in the prosecution of every undertaking of his life, and the indomitable perseverance with which he pursued his object, undiscouraged by adversity, and undismayed by obstacles, however formidable in appearance; his undaunted courage, which knew no fear; his fortitude and self-control, which enabled him to bear, with a serenity approaching the sublime, the accumulated misery of his condition, when the storms of life came thick upon him; his mind, prolific in expedients for every emergency, and his quick perceptions and powerful grasp of intellect, all stamp him a man formed for great deeds, and capable of noble purposes; whilst the polished elegance, the winning grace and ease of his man-

ners, the finished culture of his mind, the clearness and terseness of his language, both in composition and declamation, excite our warmest admiration, and command our respect; we instinctively feel that such endowments and accomplishments must be crowned with distinguished success in whatever walk of life it may be his lot to move.

Such were the splendid faculties and endowments of Aaron Burr; and it was only requisite that they should have been exercised, submissive to the control of Providence, to have established him in the front rank of that illustrious band of men, each singly preëminent in his generation, who have faintly exemplified the majesty of manhood as it came from the hand of its Creator, fashioned and formed in the perfection of His Image.

But our Author has revealed to us also foul blots in the character of Burr, deep-seated in the very heart's core of his being, and it becomes our painful duty now to speak plainly of these, and to trace their consequences, in their practical working, in his life.

We have already remarked that *selfishness* was the great predominating trait of his character. This is unquestionably true, although (paradoxical as it may seem) he was lavish in the expenditure of money to a degree often bordering upon folly. *His* selfishness, however, had little affinity with miserly penuriousness, the petty vice usually bearing that name; it was the great motive power of his existence, and resulted, necessarily, from the principles adopted as the guides of his life. Professing to believe that time measured the duration of human existence; that this world was the only theatre of man's action; and that enjoyment here was the object of life; he seems to have passed through the full period of man's allotted time, without catching one glimpse of the great, consolatory fact, that the *happiness, as well as the duty* of man, consists in consecrating his heart and his life to his God and his fellow men. To appropriate to himself honor and power; to succeed in every pursuit to which he might be prompted by the convictions of his judgment, or the suggestions of his depraved appetites; to will firmly, and to do effectually, were with him the only aims worthy of a man's ambition. It resulted, as a necessary consequence from such principles, that, with him, the end sanctified the means; that *might* constituted *right*, and that each individual of the human family was entitled to all of the enjoyment which he could attain, regardless of the feelings or interests of all others; such, whether formed into a definite creed in words or not, was the resulting

consequence of his infidel principles ; and such were proved, by the whole tenor of his actions through life, to have been the motives of his conduct. To keep within the letter of the law and thus to screen himself from its penalties, was essential to his ideas of happiness. With the exception, therefore, of his duel with Hamilton, it is not known *as an established fact*, that he ever transgressed a positive penal enactment ; but to seek his own individual enjoyments, regardless of the spirit of all law, human and Divine, was the daily practice of his life. And if we may, in charity, suppose that anything like a prayerful ejaculation ever proceeded from his soul, the tenor of his life would seem to prove that his petition must have been, "give me an opportunity to attain," in place of that great, Divinely appointed safeguard of human virtue, "lead us not into temptation."

That Burr was in fact a *roué*, our Author is compelled to admit ; and the chapter which he devotes to this phase of Burr's life, we regard not only as the most reprehensible in the book, but as the most pernicious in its tendency to debauch the morals of the young, of any of the latitudinarian writings of our day. That a Biographer should desire and attempt to relieve the character of the subject of his work from all undeserved obloquy, is of course but natural and right ; but that he should endeavor to excuse or gloss over acknowledged crimes, of the deepest dye, against the well-being of society, and for the purpose of redeeming his hero from the public execration which his conduct has heaped upon him, should so express himself as, by implication even, to strip the crimes themselves of the abhorrent features which constitute the chief public safeguard against their commission,—these, of themselves, constitute offenses against public morals, which deserve the severest reprehension.

That our Author has done this we deem abundantly evident. We cheerfully accord to him the sincere conviction that he has proved that Burr was no farther guilty than he admits him to have been ; in other words, that he was not a gross debauchee ; nor the universal assailant of all female virtue, which common fame represented him to have been. But the damning charge is still palpable, upon the face of the book, that Burr's numerous, admitted, offenses are no otherwise reprobated than by the simple admission, at the outset, that "he was no saint ;"—that the claims of Burr to exculpate himself from the guilt of his own conduct, by accusations against his victims, of "half-way advances," are related in language, which seems to indicate the opinion of the Author, that the

vile claim is quite satisfactory ;—that the denial of Burr, that he had ever consorted with the previously vile, chosen his victims from the lower walks of life, or deliberately seduced virgin innocence from the path of rectitude, is related with an air of triumphant vindication, as though the absence of those specific crimes, established, for his hero, a *fund of virtue* to counterbalance his other offenses ;—and that he claims to have *vindicated the character of Burr*, by proving that the number of his actual offenses was much smaller than they have been represented to have been. The fact, that the very denials of Burr (by confining his victims to the persons embraced in the letter of the seventh commandment) actually establish against him guilt of the most heinous character, entirely escapes our Author's observation ; and those awful crimes which sap the very foundations of human society, seem to be of so little account, in his estimation, as not to require a word either of comment or vindication.

The extreme credulity of Mr. Parton in receiving, as a trust worthy denial of an alleged fact, the badinage of the man of the world, about accepting, as an *act of politeness*, a false paternity, because the mother had *done him the honor to ascribe it to him*, will be quite apt to raise doubts in reflecting minds, as to the correctness of other conclusions in the book. For our present purposes it is only important, in so far as it manifests the appreciation of our Author of the gravest offenses which can be committed by man against his fellow beings.

In concluding our remarks, already greatly extended beyond our anticipated limits, we would earnestly exhort the young men of our country, to ponder well the important lessons deducible from this Biography of Aaron Burr. No human being ever exhibited more strikingly in his life, on the one hand, the certain rewards resulting from a thorough preparation, in youth, of both the mental and bodily faculties, for the conflicts of life ; the formation of habits of diligent industry ; and the harmonious combination of refined manners with a polished personal address : or, on the other hand, the disastrous consequences flowing from ill regulated passions, infidel and dissolute principles ; the perusal of irreligious or immoral books ; the association with corrupt companions ; the neglect of religious instruction ; the indulgence of the selfish propensities of the heart ; and the lack of a steady and consistent adherence to principle in all of the associations of life. His great acquirements, united with his preëminent talents, carried him rapidly forward almost within reach of the pinnacle of fame, from whence his corrupt principles and vicious

conduct precipitated him with headlong velocity to the deepest depths of conceivable misery.

May all youthful aspirants for fame read diligently, and understandingly, the lessons thus afforded to them, and apply them effectually in fashioning their own courses of life.

Parents and guardians of youth too may here learn to appreciate the awful responsibility of their position. The power to fashion at their will, and the duty to direct aright, the opening faculties of the young, is, by the wisdom of the Divine economy, imposed upon them, and they can only discharge themselves from the tremendous responsibilities of their position, by a diligent study, and thorough appreciation, of the characters of their charges, a careful supervision of the influences operating upon their young minds, and a faithful employment of their full legitimate authority in controlling the studies, and associations, which will effectually shape the course of the human bark as soon as it shall launch forth upon the voyage of life.

Let them beware lest through their neglect, or misapplied exertions, the splendid abilities of some future Aaron Burr shall founder in the sea of infidelity, or make shipwreck upon the quicksands of vice.

ART. V.—THE BISHOP OF TENNESSEE AND CHURCH PARTIES.

Bishop Otey's Pastoral Letter, &c.

THE RT. REV. AND VENERABLE BISHOP OTEY has lately been subjected to the annoyance of a cross fire from the two opposite parties in the Church, which occupy the extreme flanks of Christ's militant army, and which style themselves, respectively, and most meekly, (?) "the Catholics" and "the Evangelicals." If we were called upon to name these men, judging from their teaching, so far as it is distinctive enough to form a species, and judging more especially from the results which their systems have undeniably reached in England, we should call them the *Romanizers* and the *Rationalizers* of the Church. We ought, however, to make an exception in behalf of a small, but pretty active Calvinistic element in the Church, and which is neither Rationalistic nor Romanistic. Considering the origin of a very large number of our Clergy, it is not surprising that such an element should exist among us; and yet, we have never known a very strong Calvinist in the Church, who was either altogether easy, or very useful. And most certainly, the man who is capable of believing the Calvinistic Formula, a specimen of which we give in a Note,* ought at least to allow

* "Sec. 3. By the decree of God, for the manifestation of His glory, some men and angels are predestinated unto everlasting life, and others foreordained to everlasting death.

"Sec. 4. These angels and men thus predestinated and foreordained, are particularly and unchangeably designed; and their number is so certain and definite that it cannot be increased or diminished.

"Sec. 5. Those of mankind that are predestinated unto life, God, before the foundation of the world was laid, according to his eternal and immutable purpose, and the secret counsel and good pleasure of his will, hath chosen in Christ unto everlasting glory, out of his mere free grace and love, without any foresight of faith or good works, or perseverance in either of them, or any other thing in the creature, as conditions, or causes moving him thereto; and all to the praise of His glorious grace.

"Sec. 6. As God hath appointed the elect unto glory, so hath he, by the eternal and most free purpose of his will, foreordained all the means thereunto. Wherefore, they who are elected, being fallen in Adam, are redeemed in Christ, are effectually called unto faith in Christ by His Spirit working in due season; are justified, adopted, sanctified, and kept by his power through faith unto salvation. *Neither are any other redeemed by Christ, effectually called, justified, adopted, sanctified, and saved, but the elect only.*

us to believe that God always attends His own appointed ordinances with a blessing suited to the condition of those who properly receive them.

The history of these two events, which have recently transpired in Tennessee, forms so truthful an illustration of a state of things existing among us, that it is worth daguerreotyping for preservation and reference. Besides, the subject furnishes occasion for a few plain considerations of truth and of duty, which we wish in this place to present to our readers.

The first affair may be thus stated. The Bishop of Tennessee was called upon to consecrate a new Church, recently erected at Riverside, in his Diocese, which Church building, while in process of completion, came providentially, and (as we say) unfortunately, under the sole direction of one, and he a Layman, whose ecclesiastical sympathies, or whose ecclesiological fancies, led him to introduce into it and around it a mass of symbolism, much of it Mediaeval and Romish in its meaning, and most certainly foreign to the doctrines and usages of our Reformed Branch of the Catholic Church. The Bishop, in entire accordance with the wishes of the incumbent, and as the executor and administrator of the Common Law of the Church, requested or directed, (we know not which, nor does it really make any difference which, as we would show if we were to argue the question as a point of Law,) that certain grossly offensive and superstitious symbols be removed previous to consecration. Fortunately for the Bishop and for the Church, his request, or direction, was complied with; and he then proceeded to consecrate the Church to the Worship and Service of Almighty God, according to the rites and usages of the Protestant Episcopal Church in this country. The symbols which were taken away were a movable Cross, which had been set up on a Super-Altar! and two huge wooden candlesticks. This was the Bishop's first offense in one direction.

Now for the other story. The Bishop wished to make an appeal to his Diocese in behalf of the cause of Missions, as conducted by the Church through its regularly appointed Missionary Board. But he found the attention of his Diocese pre-occupied with a call from another direction; a call issued by a self-constituted, irresponsible body, and he thought proper, as the Bishop and chief Pastor of the Church in Ten-

"Sec. 7. The rest of mankind God was pleased, according to the unsearchable counsel of His own will, whereby he extendeth or withholdeth mercy as he pleaseth, for the glory of his sovereign power over His creatures, to pass by, and to ordain them to dishonor and wrath, for their sin, to the praise of His glorious justice."—*Presbyterian Confession of Faith*, Ch. iii.

nessee in his Pastoral Letter, to utter the following words of warning.

"I must, as in duty bound, warn you against the unauthorized application of an association at Philadelphia calling itself the *Episcopal Missionary Association for the West*. It asks for your money that it may expend it on such objects and such men as it may select, and not on such as the Domestic Committee of Missions, the elected organ of the Church's Board for that purpose, may, in conjunction with our Bishops, choose. Remember the Apostle's word—'Mark them which cause divisions and offenses contrary to the doctrine which ye have learned, and avoid them.' Address your contributions to A. O. Harris, Treasurer, Memphis, Tenn.

"Beseeching God to bless you, and to accept your offerings for His name's sake, I remain your faithful friend and affectionate pastor,

JAS. H. OTEY."

These two bold and significant acts of the Bishop, and bearing so strongly in two opposite directions, have called forth, on both sides, manifestations of feeling, the intensity of which our readers have seen for themselves, if they have read the language in which it has been uttered. Certain opposite parties are found at once uniting together in hostility to the Bishop, who never, as we recollect, were ever united before on anything. But so it is. Extremes meet. When the Bishop of Tennessee exercises his Episcopal functions in his own Diocese, then men, who do not belong to his Diocese, unite together to stir up a spirit of disaffection and resistance in his spiritual household, to traduce his character, and destroy his influence. Not only this, but Laymen! it seems, are found "set apart" (we know not by what ordinance) to the office of instructing and rebuking our oldest Bishops, of reading homilies to our Clergy on orthodoxy and Church Order, and backing up their asserted power and prerogatives, by appealing to the passions and prejudices of the Laity. We venture the suggestion, and we ask that it be remembered, that there may be more in this whole movement than now meets the eye.

In respect to the Church at Riverside, while it is amusing, and perhaps hopeful, to see certain parties becoming suddenly great sticklers for Canons and Rubrics, yet with a full knowledge of the facts before us, we are confident in saying, that Bishop Otey, in what he did, only asserted the Common Law of the Church, as he not only had a right to do, but by his Consecration vows, was bound to do; and we rejoice that he was both man enough, and Bishop enough, to put his foot upon a piece of silly impertinence, and to treat it precisely as it de-

served. As for Canon Law in such a case, the idea itself is ridiculous. It is rather a question of Bishops, or no Bishops. Shall the head of an household stop to enquire whether there is a Statute Law, defining words, looks, and gestures, before he kicks an impertinent and impudent fellow from his door, and from the presence of his family! And shall the Bishop of Tennessee be required to wait the passage of an equally explicit Canon Law, before he prevents the Scarlet Lady, with her painted cheeks, and wanton stare, and tawdry attire, and mincing gait, from being installed as the presiding genius of his Diocese! Away with such quibbling, and with such frippery. Or, if such matters must be formally considered, turn them over to those who practically, and on every possible occasion, ignore the beautiful Order and Worship of the Church, and then tell of it in the newspapers! or to those who, in solemn conclave, and with elongated visage, discuss such awful questions as the length of the fringe on the end of a stole, or the bore of a *piscina*! But, men who are men, or rather, who are Churchmen, Christians, and men, all in one, will never stop to dignify such trifling, and such triflers, with the solemnities of formal Law. And we trust there is manhood enough in the Church, among her Clergy and her Laity, to appreciate such a policy. This much is certain. The Bishop of Tennessee, in this matter, has not acted altogether without precedent; and that, too, on the part of men who, like the Bishop of Tennessee, are quite able, if need be, to take care of themselves.

On this whole case, we could not say less without injustice to one of our oldest, ablest, and most revered Prelates; whose long life has been a living sacrifice for CHRIST and His Church, and whose record of hardship and toil should at least have secured the silence of his accusers. While we ever stand ready to contend for a government of Law rather than of arbitrary self-will, and to resist every encroachment upon the freedom of the press; yet we are to take equal caution lest our pretended love of freedom should degenerate into a mere spirit of faction and of wild licentiousness. Under all free governments, in all times, here has always been a dangerous, and, usually, fatal tendency.

In respect to Bishop Otey's Pastoral, the whole subject opens up very grave questions, which must sooner or later be met. Everybody knows, that the Foreign Missionary work of the Church has always been under the control of men of a certain type of Church views. Everybody knows, also, that the Domestic Missionary work was for a long time under the management of men of different sentiments. Everybody knows,

that at our last General Convention, measures were taken to give to our Domestic Missions a more comprehensive and general character; to make them the work, not of a sect, or of a party, but of the whole Church, and so unite the whole Church in their support. The enlargement of the Missionary Board, and the adding to it of a great number of new men, Clergy and Laity connected with the leading Parishes all over the country, and the noble spirit of harmony and zeal manifested on the floor of the Convention, were hailed with deep feelings of gratitude as a pledge of a new era in our Missionary work. The Domestic Committee had already had infused into it, and as a measure of conciliation, an influential element representing this new, and Catholic policy. The Rev. Dr. HAWKS was placed at the head of the Presbyters on that Committee, and the Rev. Dr. COOKE was added to that Committee, for the avowed purpose of thus inspiring confidence in this great enterprise. Everybody (almost) said, that now we as a Church have nothing to do, but cease our bickerings and go to work. It will be remembered, also, that these concessions have all been made by one side; and a side which, if lines were strictly drawn, comprises a very large majority of our Bishops and of our Dioceses. To a gratifying extent, anticipations have been realized. The Reports of our Domestic Secretary, the Rev. Dr. VAN KLEECK, show increasing unity and efficiency in the work of Domestic Missions. The spirit of party strife and contention is dying out, and if let alone would soon disappear. A number of our Bishops have lately enjoined upon their several Dioceses the special duty of mutual confidence and brotherly love. The late admirable Address of the Bishop of New York deserves particular mention in this respect. And still—what has all along been predicted by some—it would appear that there is still left among us a spirit of faction, which will not be satisfied with compromise; and which is resolved on peace only on one condition. We need not say what that condition is. The Bishop of Tennessee has spoken of this whole matter frankly and truthfully, and he will be honored for it by every loyal Churchman in the land. Our hope is, that there is among us more of charity and unity, than the surface of events would seem to indicate. But of this, it must be left to the future to decide.

But what is this new organization at Philadelphia, to which the Bishop alludes? What are its pretensions? What are its claims? What are its complaints? On what grounds does it presume to sit in judgment on and condemn the Missionary Board of the Church; and to challenge for itself the special

confidence of Churchmen? These are plain questions. But the exigency of the case provokes the inquiry. Is it pretended that the funds of the Domestic Committee have been perverted to the support of men who are not true and loyal to the Church? Is it urged that there has been a Romish element developed in high stations of trust and authority among us within the last few years? Grant it. And yet, has there not been witnessed, also, the manifestation of a spirit of loyalty which has promptly and effectually repelled these men from our camp? And, besides, if there be the leaven of Popery in the Church, is it any the more likely to be purged out by the organizing of parties on such a basis? And is there no danger in such an event, of an opposite, and equally dangerous extreme in the other direction? If there be men in the Church who are treacherous to the Faith, and especially if there be such men as Missionaries, feeding upon the Church's charities, while they are undermining her citadel, then come forward manfully and frankly, and say so to the Domestic Committee. Name the men. Specify your charges. Instead of dark insinuations and wholesale denunciations, meaning, nobody knows what, and against, nobody knows whom, present your complaints to the proper authorities, and, our word for it, you shall have all the satisfaction you deserve.

But is it so, that the men who are preferring these complaints against the Missions and the Missionaries of the Church, and who, by imputations against their brethren, are seeking to stir up hatreds and divisions among us, are themselves so extraordinarily endowed with wisdom, that they alone can be trusted as the special and irresponsible guardians of the Church's honor and the Church's money? This, most certainly, would seem to be the plea. But who are they that make it? Is it themselves? And yet, unless such a point is to be taken for granted, are they indeed, not themselves, but others being judges, comparatively and above their brethren, so distinguished for their strict fidelity to the Church's standards, for their prudence, wisdom, and success, in doing the Church's work, that power, and irresponsible power, too, can be safely lodged only in their hands? There must be qualifications of a very remarkable character which shall avail to set off fully against the evils of such a movement in the Church; a movement which necessarily begins with imputations upon the character of a large number of our leading Bishops and Clergy; which implies that their piety or their wisdom is to be questioned or denied; and which, if successful, will assuredly result in the spectacle of the Church herself virtually rent in twain from one

extreme border of our country to the other ; her Clergy and the members of her parishes set in array against each other—and all on such a plea, and for such an end as this ! And, as an inevitable necessity, there will be developed, also, a bitterness of temper and of language, which has never yet been witnessed among us, and which will prove not the least of the evils of our distracted Church. Are we ready for all this ?

Many years of pretty close observation, and an acquaintance by no means limited, have served to convince us, very decidedly, that true love to CHRIST, and true loyalty to His Church, are not quite the exclusive possession of any one party among us ; and that true piety and true Churchmanship are full as likely to be found among those unostentatious, hard-working men, Clergy and Laity, and who, we believe, constitute the large majority of the Church in this country, as among those unquiet persons who boast of their piety or their Churchmanship, and who, under the one rallying cry or the other, are thus seeking to rend the Body of CHRIST. An earnest, living piety, a self-sacrificing, humble zeal for CHRIST, and for the salvation of souls, we honor and revere wherever we find it ; but we confess to no great respect for an element, however pretentious it be, if it be found to lack charity, manners, and morals.

The Church allows and tolerates very great diversity of doctrinal opinion and interpretation among her members, so that they be loyal to CHRIST and to His Church. Certain objective and certain subjective tendencies, certain inherent proclivities to Divine Sovereignty on the one hand, and to Free Grace and Human Accountability on the other, have always existed in the Church, from St. Augustine's day, and even from the time of St. Paul and St. James, to our own, and the reader of history knows with what malignity the weapons of this *odium theologicum* have been hurled on both sides. And yet, these opposite tendencies, to which we have adverted, always must and will exist. They are older than Platonism and Aristotelianism ; they grow out of the very constitution of human nature. They were ordered, we doubt not, by a wise Providence, as a counterbalance to, and check upon, each other. CHRIST'S ONE CHURCH must embrace both. No Church can be truly catholic in character ; no Church can be as comprehensive as our race ; no Church can live in unity and peace ; no Church can work effectively for the 'salvation of the world ; which does not recognize both these inherent susceptibilities and tendencies.

To those among ourselves, therefore, who would counsel strifes and divisions on such grounds as these, we would say, "Sirs, ye are brethren." In the pertinent and stirring language

of the Rev. Dr. Tyng :* "Have we any lines of division, or motives for separation, at all to be compared in importance and worth, with the reasons for our union, or with the facts on which we are actually agreed?" "How inferior in consequence are the points in reference to Church authority and discipline, upon which we might differ in opinion, when compared with these?" "If we are ever to find and enjoy anything like spiritual union on earth, the promised gift of the Saviour to His disciples, past events have sufficiently proved that we are to seek for it, and to expect it now, with a reasonable prospect of success, only within the limits of our own spiritual household." "We have a perfectly common interest, an indissoluble unity of experience before us. *We stand or fall together.*"

We would reëcho Dr. Tyng's "Plea for Union," in these, our own perilous times. Never before were there such golden opportunities before the Church, if, with eye to eye, and heart to heart, and hand to hand, she would only seize them. All around us are up and doing. Methodists, Papists, Presbyterians and Congregationalists are, one or other, or all, covering every nook and corner of this land with their Missionary web. And still the heart of the people is turned more and more toward us, as having something which they want. Is this a time for us, a comparatively feeble band in numbers, to be wasting our strength and life in fratricidal warfare? Let us rather throw our united zeal and strength into the great Missionary work of the Church. Let us know each other better, and we shall love each other more. We do not really differ from each other near as much as many suppose. It is quite possible that there may be some things to respect, perhaps to imitate, even among those whom at a distance we have been wont to look ungraciously upon. And while we have more confidence in each other, let us have more faith in CHRIST, Who hath placed us together to labor in the same Vineyard, and Who, most assuredly, will take care of His own Glory and of His own blessed cause. Let us remember that we ourselves differ from our brethren, just as much as they do from us. Let our motto be, "in essentials Unity, in non-essentials Liberty, and in all things Charity." So, shall we "keep the unity of the Spirit in the bond of peace." So, united the Church will stand, and will grow in beauty and power. So, CHRIST will be honored, and His enemies ashamed. And so, that last prayer will be answered, "That they all may be ONE; as Thou, Father, art in me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in us; THAT THE WORLD MAY BELIEVE THAT THOU HAST SENT ME."

* Convention Sermon, "PLEA FOR UNION," Philadelphia, 1844.

ART. VI.—DR. PUSEY ON THE ELECTION OF BISHOPS.

MY DEAR ——— :

Our common friend ——— has asked me to look at that portion of Dr. Pusey's late work on "The Councils of the Church" which relates to the share of the Laity in the appointment of Bishops. He thinks it to be regretted that a name so deservedly eminent and venerable should be found committed to the statements there made.

I am as much surprised as sorry to find the ground that has been taken, and the course that has been pursued to make it good, such as they are. Elsewhere, I should have been apt to think them the result of ingenious theorizing, on a subject only superficially studied. Coming from the pen of one whose deep learning is as certain as his thorough honesty, they can only be viewed as a remarkable and startling exhibition of the force of prejudice.

I cannot but regard the whole passage as inaccurate and unreliable, both in its details and in its conclusions. But it is the air, and tone, and suggestive arrangement of the evidence and discussion that most dissatisfy me. Of course, there is no false statement made, no perversion or distortion of anything brought forward as fact or testimony. Yet there is a selection, a coloring given by collocation and the use of emphatic type, a reticence of facts equally and more important, as compared with those adduced, that avail greatly for the conveyal to the mind of the reader of impressions widely different from the truth of history.

Dr. Pusey's position is, as stated by himself, (*Contents*, p. iv,) that "Election of Bishops" was "made by Bishops, in presence, and with the testimony and goodwill of the People;" that "the new Bishop was chosen not 'by' but '*in the presence of the people*;' " and "was '*given to the people*,' not chosen by them." (p. 41.)

This is his own deliberate and final statement of it. Elsewhere, he makes it in a form liable to less exception. Treating of the indirect influence of the Laity in Church legislation, through the choice of those to whom it is committed or restricted, (p. 10,) he admits that "in St. Cyprian's time they 'not only' "accepted the judgment of the Bishops of the province," or else "through their own personal knowledge of

those presented to them for their Bishops, *enabled* the Bishops *to correct* that judgment," but furthermore, as an alternative practice "*presented to the Synod of Bishops for their judgment* such persons as they themselves knew and valued."

Now as regards theory and practice, this statement, with one correction (the substitution of "such *person* or persons" for "such persons") is all that is contended for by the advocates of the rights of the Laity in Episcopal elections. It would fully meet all that is done in the American Church, or asked for in the British Colonial Churches.

But as regards historical fact, it still falls short of the whole truth. In reality, there is on record still a third alternative action of the Laity; they presented the person whom they desired to have for Bishop *to the consecrator*, for ordination.

The case proving this occurred in the middle of the period to which Dr. Pusey's book is limited, and, as nearly as can be known, during the episcopate of Cyprian, his first witness. It is recounted in detail by Gregory of Nyssa, in his Life of his famous namesake of Neo-Cæsarea.

According to his account, Cumana, (the Comana of Strabo,) a neighboring city, (seventy miles distant from Neo-Cæsarea,) sends a delegation to Gregory, asking him to establish a bishoprick there. He goes and stays some days, preparing them sedulously for the work before them. At length the time arrives for carrying their desire into effect, *καὶ ἀναδοιχθῆναι τινὰ τῆς παρ' αὐτοῖς ἐκκλησίας ἀρχιερέα*, and for some one belonging to "the Church among them to receive the chief priesthood. Then the chief among them were all busied in bringing forward such as seemed to be preëminent for birth, for eloquence, and for other distinguishing qualities. For *they thought* that as these were conspicuous in Gregory himself, the person to be introduced into the same office must not be destitute of them. (τὸν ἐπὶ τὴν χάριν ταύτην ἐρχόμενον.)"

Πολλαχῇ δὲ ταῖς ψήφοις μεριζομένων, καὶ ἄλλων ἄλλον προαιρουμένων,— 'the votes being greatly divided, and some preferring one, some another,' Gregory looked for some divine direction, *πρὸς τὸ προκείμενον συμβουλήν*. He thought of Samuel and the sons of Jesse: 'paying no attention to the interest made for each of the nominees,' τὰς περὶ ἐκάστου τῶν ἐψηφισμένων σπουδὰς παραλείπων, he concerned himself exclusively with the question whether there were any who before the nomination had lived as became the sacred office, in continence and virtue; and, as the people presented their several candidates with commendations each in behalf of the object of his own choice, ὡς δὲ ἵι μὲν, παρῆγον τοὺς ὑποψηφισμένους μετ' ἐγκωμίων, ἕκαστος τὸν παρ' αὐτοῦ

προβαλλόμενος, and he, instead of attaching importance to their claims, recommended them to seek among those of lower station, of whom they might possibly find some one still more exalted in the things that pertain to the soul, and endowed with heavenly riches,—ύβριν ὡήθη τις τῶν προσεσχηκότων τῆς ψήφου—[I pray you, mark this expression! can anything more explicitly indicate a regularly conducted formal election?]
“one of those who had been presiding at the vote felt himself insulted by the indisposition of the Bishop to accept of any of the candidates put forward for their superiority in rank, wealth, or eloquence, (μηδένος ἐπὶ ἱερωσύνην παραδεχθέντος.) and said to him in a taunting way, *‘Εἰ ταῦτα κελεύεις,* If such is your determination, to overlook persons of such pretensions, *τούς πάσης ἐξελεγμένους τῆς πόλεως,* those who *have been chosen* out of the whole city, and to have some one from the very lowest ranks taken for elevation to the episcopate, *εἰς προστασίαν τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀνηλεηθῆναι τινα,* it is time for you to call Alexander the charcoal burner to the episcopate (*ᾧρα σοι—καλῶν ἐπὶ τὴν ἱερωσύνην:*) and, if you say so, *transferring our votes,* the whole city will agree together upon him—*μεταδάντες ἐπὶ τοῦτον, συμφωνήσωμεν πρὸς ἀλλήλους τῶς ψήφοις ἢ πόλιν ἅπασα.*—Gregory bethinks himself that it is not without divine overruling Providence that the charcoal burner *ἐν μνήμῃ τῶν ψηφισάντων γενέσθαι, ‘came into the mind of the voters.’* The man is brought, taken aside and examined by the Bishop, and turns out to be not only a good Christian, but a man of eminent gifts. Gregory inquires concerning his connections and history, is satisfied, and gives orders to have him decently arrayed, fit for presentation to the assembly. In the meanwhile, (*αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν καταλαβὼν τὸ συνέδριον,*) he occupies the assembly with a discourse on the holy ministry, the qualifications for it, and the suitable life—*τοῖς τοιοῦτοις λόγοις παρακατέχων τὸν σὺλλογον.* Alexander is brought back, cleansed and arrayed in a suit of Gregory’s own robes; ‘and all turning to him, and wonderfully affected by his appearance,’ receive a lecture from the Bishop on the danger of superficial judgments, after which *προσάγει τῷ Θεῷ διὰ τῆς ἱερωσύνης τὸν ἄνδρα* ‘he presents the man to God, by consecration, after the form prescribed for the impartation of the grace of the holy ministry.’”*

I have given this account very much at length, because I doubt whether there is another equally particular relation of the circumstances of an episcopal election within the first four centuries. Much of the language has been quoted, partly to show how certainly it expresses the process of election by the

* GREGOR. NYSSEN. *Vit. Gregorii Thaumaturgi*, pp. 286–291, ed. Ger. Vossii.

people, in terms not capable of any other explanation ; partly, to show how orderly the whole procedure is represented to have been ; and partly to exemplify the use in such connexion, of particular expressions, which, if they had occurred alone, might have been seized as proofs of an appointment by a Bishop, looking only for assent and approval on the people's part.

If there were nothing exceptional in this case, or liable to objections in the account of it, it seems to me that its minute and full details must be admitted to settle the question about lay voting in the election of a Bishop in the third century. Everything ambiguous or defective elsewhere, must be brought to them for interpretation. Nothing but express contradictory assertion would suffice to set the evidence aside.

But it must be admitted that the story, like some others in the same Life, has a graphic particularity which surprises us in a biographer writing at an interval of more than a century from the events he is narrating. St. Gregory, of Nyssa, living in the latter half of the fourth century, could hardly have had information from first sources of the transaction at Comana in the middle of the third. But then, any doubtfulness which this consideration might throw upon the detail of the narrative, must be counterbalanced by the testimony of the later age to the right in question. No doubt the narrator believed his story. He saw in it no improbability. He told it in language which seemed to him the fittest. Living in times when questions of ordinations and the involved rights had been brought up in every shape, and had occupied the closest attention of his own nearest friends, he could not have overlooked a peculiarity so great as the Comanan election must have been, as described by him, if elsewhere the Bishop was *given to the people, not chosen by them*. If the details of the narrative are the mere filling up of the general outlines of a remarkable incident in the episcopate of the Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, then it is very clear that in the Nyssene Bishop's day, the part of the people in an election would have been such as he attributes to those of Comana in the preceding century. If, as is altogether likely, he repeats the particulars just as he received them, it is equally clear that he saw in the elective franchise of the Laity, exercised in the most formal and fullest manner, nothing enough out of the way to call for any remark or explanation. Nevertheless, the case of Comana, as related, is one of an exceptional class. It was, certainly, a creation of a *See*, as well as of a *Bishop* ; and on the mere face of the narrative, would seem to have been carried through by a single Bishop.

The latter is not likely. The narrator was too familiar with the canons forbidding such an ordination, not to have alleged the necessary justification for the subject of his eulogy, if the transaction had been a departure from the canonical usage, on the score of necessity. No doubt the Bishop of Neo-Cæsarea, the metropolis of Pontus Polemoniacus, had two or more of his suffragans with him; although, as the act was one of strictly metropolitan jurisdiction, and the authority (*κῆρος*) was, by usage, embodied in the subsequent Nicene canon, in the metropolitan alone, his biographer thought it unnecessary to mention an assistance which was a matter of course. His silence about *Bishops* in this case, shows how little can be concluded from the silence about *the people* in other statements made with much less detail.

But the case of the creation of a See is exceptional, and as such, the instance of Comana is all the more remarkable. The regular and formal election took place just where it might least be looked for; and where, if nothing of the kind had taken place, it would have been no proof against the rights of the Catholic Laity in an established See.

"The Catholic Laity," I say, using the judicious distinction of De Dominis: "Loquor de plebe Catholica fidei. Nam cum primum alicui plebi episcopus ordinatur, et mittitur ad eam convertendam, non est necesse ipsius expectare assensum; imo ut plurimum, invitis etiam est dandus pastor: et gentibus Evangelio reluctantibus, Apostoli Evangelistæ accesserunt."* In fact, we carry out the principle in the appointment of our Missionary Bishops, by the General Convention.

Obviously a diocese lapsed into heresy, or adjudicated schism, falls under this principle; and by its application, I believe, every clear instance of appointment of a Bishop without previous consultation of the Laity that is producible, may be explained. The instances of St. Basil's action, produced by Dr. Pusey, (pp. 243, s.) all belong to this class; although some, if not all of them, afford plain traces of more or less exercise of the rights of the Laity, notwithstanding. In that of Faustus, for instance, (on p. 259,) Dr. Pusey has omitted to mention that he came to St. Basil not only with the "letters from a certain Papa," but as the elect of the people of a See, the previous occupant of which, Cyril, had been acquitted of charges brought against him, by St. Basil, and nevertheless subsequently rejected by them.†

* *De Repub. Eccles.* III. iii. 51. (p. 414, D.)

† Hermant, *Vie de S. Basile*, I. 535, s., 540.

In such rejection, whether rightfully or wrongfully, they did but exercise a right asserted by St. Cyprian and the Carthaginian Synod, whose language, for want of attention to the preceding context, Dr. Pusey has misunderstood and applied to the case of election.

The letter of the African Bishops to their brethren in Spain has throughout a double reference, to the case of deposition of Bishops for evil living, as well as to the precaution necessary for the election of fit successors. Sabinus, who brought the Spanish appeal, had been properly elected in place of Basilides, properly deposed, with whom Stephen of Rome improperly kept up communion. The African Bishops vindicate the election and the deposition, and censure the hasty and insufficiently grounded action of the Roman Bishop. In order to this, they set out with proving, from passages of the Old and New Testaments, that the priesthood must be free from reproach. These are applied first to the case of election: "Quae ante oculos habentes," &c. "Keeping these things before our eyes, and anxiously and religiously considering them, we ought in the ordination of Bishops, to choose none but unblemished and upright priests," &c.* Then they turn to the case of deposition: "Nec sibi plebs blandiatur," &c. 'Nor let a people flatter itself that it can be free from the contagion of guilt while it communicates with a priest' (meaning *Bishop*) 'who is a sinner, and lends its consent to the unrighteous and unlawful Episcopate of its prelate,' &c.† This proved from Hosea, ix, 4, and Numbers xvi, 26, the inference as to Christian duty in both the first and second cases, is drawn in a sentence, the double reference of the last member of which has been overlooked by Dr. Pusey. "Propter quod plebs obsequens," &c.

* This is the Oxford translation: but here, as in other parts of the epistle, does not do entire justice to the accuracy of the original expression. The letter, it is to be observed, is addressed, not to Bishops, but to "Felix, presbyter, and the members of the congregations," (it is our nearest expression for '*plebibus consistentibus*') "at Leon and Astorga, and to Lælius, deacon, and the members of the congregation at Merida, brethren in the Lord." To these, principally lay brethren, the Bishops say,—“considering these things, in ordinations of priests” (meaning Bishops) “we ought to elect none prelates (*antistites*) but unblemished and upright persons.” The Synod speaks to the laity of ‘election’ as a common right and duty, in which, when ordinations occur, the principle contended for is to be observed. Of the person chosen, a term is used, implying an inferior relation on the part of some, at least, among the choosers. Bishops might elect ‘consacerdotes:’ but they must be joining the people with themselves when they say, “*antistites eligere debemus.*”

† Here, again, the Oxford translation is loose. By substituting a plural for the singular of the original, and changing its rendering of “*sacerdos*” from ‘Bishop,’ which it had just before used, it obscures the obvious reference to the case of a diocese, oppressed with the calamity of an unworthy Bishop.

"Wherefore a people which obeyeth the precepts of the Lord and feareth God, ought to separate itself from a prelate who is a sinner, nor mingle itself up with the sacrifices of a sacrilegious priest, (*bishop*;) especially since it has itself the power either of choosing worthy priests or rejecting the unworthy."* This last clause obviously looks back to the whole foregoing argument, and the double nature of the business before the parties: affirming the obligation of a diocese to keep itself free from sin, both in "refusing an unworthy Bishop," as Astorgas had done, and was still bound to do, in consenting to the deposition of Basilides, and resisting his attempted restoration by Stephen; and also in 'electing a worthy one,' as had also been done in the choice of Sabinus.

The immediately important object being the maintenance of the rightful election of Sabinus, as against the attempted restoration of Basilides, the Synod after merely affirming the power to "refuse" the latter, occupies itself with an elaborate proof of the importance of properly guarded ordination. It proves it first, "*de divina auctoritate descendere*"—"to be derived from divine authority that a priest should be chosen in the presence of the people," &c.; and then, secondly, "*Quod postea secundum divina magisteria observatur in actis apostolorum.*" "That afterwards the observance in the Acts of the Apostles accords with the divine teaching (or direction)," &c., citing Acts i, 15, vi, 2. To this divine teaching of the Old Testament and apostolic observance of the New, it affirms the importance of adhering, in the language which Dr. Pusey has transferred from the principle itself to the practice under it. "The Synod," he says, "speaks of the mode of election as a 'Divine Tradition and an Apostolic observance.'" (p. 39.) Surely it is not the 'mode of election' of a Bishop in the Christian Church that is so spoken of, but the divine authority for it in the Old Testament, and the apostolic recognition of that authority in practice! "On which account," says the Synod, "that is to be diligently kept and held, as of Divine tradition and apostolic observation, which we also and almost the whole of the provinces do hold, that in order to celebrate ordination rightly, the several neighboring Bishops of the same Province must come together to that people for which a prelate is ordained, and the Bishop must be appointed (*deligatur*) the people being present, which knows most fully the life of each, and is cognizant of the course of conduct of every one."

* This is the Oxford translation; adhering closely to the original. Perhaps in the last clause, it would be rendered still more accurate by giving "*vel*" its lower-Latin copulative sense—"the power both of choosing—and of rejecting."

Dr. Pusey, by his italics and repeated quotations of the phrase, seems to lay much stress on the clause, 'plebe præsente,' which he with the Oxford translation renders, "in the presence of the people;" as if it implied mere spectatorship, or at most, a permitted expression of opinion. But like several other of the expressions in the letter, it seems to be a legal term, technically used, signifying not only admission to the sight of a transaction, but official participation in it. 'Deligatio plebe præsente' is an appointment toward which the people has done its part, be that part more or less important. The African Synod regards that part as very important, and tells us why—because the people, from its knowledge of the person to be appointed, is best qualified to exercise a wholesome vigilance against the ordination of improper subjects.

The exercise of that vigilance is called in one place "Publicum iudicium ac testimonium;" in another "omnium suffragium et iudicium," in a third, "universa fraternitatis suffragium." These terms do more than imply, they very distinctly express, the use of an elective power. While they leave it open to discussion, in what mode, and at what stage of the procedure, the power may have been used, they are not consistent with the statement that the "plebs," the "universa fraternitas" to which they relate was held to the recognition of a Bishop as "*given to it not chosen by it.*" Nor are they found only in this one letter. It is Cyprian's use, to speak so of the part of the people in election. Cornelius, he says, (Ep. lv. Ox.) was "made Bishop—by the vote of the people then present—*de plebis qua tunc adfuit suffragio.*" His own election he vindicates against Fortunatus, as not to be meddled with "post *populi suffragium*, after the vote of the people." (Ep. lix. Ox.) In the last of these passages the "vote of the laity" is associated with the "consent (or agreement) of the Bishops"—'consensus co-episcoporum;' in the other with "the testimony of the clergy"—'clericorum pene omnium testimonio.' These expressions occur in documents certainly drawn up with care, under circumstances which required of the writer the most guarded accuracy. It is a mere begging of the question to assume that he spoke loosely, and used "suffragium" in a large sense to signify approving acclamations. I find no indications of such laxity in the use of language in the Church writers who have occasion to approach this subject; but, on the contrary, the more carefully expressions which at a first superficial glance seem to be used hap-hazard are weighed and compared together, and collated with rules and principles, gathered out of the whole of the fragmentary infor-

mation in our possession, the more evident it becomes that they are used with a nice accuracy indicative of clear views of principles and much familiarity with their application. It is quite in character that Baronius should have felt this so strongly, that instead of quietly assuming, with Dr. Pusey, a loose use of "*suffragium*," he thought it preferable to change the language of St. Cyprian, and distinctly affirm that he meant to ascribe, and ought to have ascribed "*suffragium ad clerum, judicium vero, quod idem est quod testimonium, ad plebem*." (*Annal.* Ao. 254. n. xlv, To. II, p. 468, B. ed. Rom.) But even the pretext of supposing such confusion of language will not avail for a second passage, in St. Cyprian's letter to Cornelius. He there expresses the whole process of "putting a Bishop in the place of one deceased" by "*Populi universi suffragio deligitur*." 'He is chosen by the suffrages of the whole people.' (*Ox. Trans.* p. 156.) Now this last is the very word used (and italicized by Dr. Pusey) in the letter of the Synod, to express the part there supposed by Dr. Pusey to be distinctly attributed to the Bishops "*plebe præsente sub omnium oculis deligatur*." 'He *is chosen*'—by the Bishops, says Dr. P., because, 1, the Bishops are just before spoken of, as convening in order to the action; 2, the knowledge of character and life which belongs to the people is alleged as the reason for their presence, in order to their judgment and testimony. But let St. Cyprian be the interpreter of his own language, and he sets aside that gloss. He expressly tells us, 1, That the Bishop "*is chosen by the vote of the people*;" 2, That this is done "*with the testimony of the clergy*," and 3, That it is ratified "*by the consent of the Bishops*." No inconsistency is discoverable in his use of language in all three epistles; no inaccuracy in either. The need of explaining away the language in the Synodical epistle as loose, and in the others as inaccurate, arises entirely from an assumed interpretation of the first.*

* Dr. Pusey thinks that a passage in St. Cyprian's first epistle to Cornelius (*Ep. xlv. Oxon*) speaks of the election of a Bishop as made "with the testimony" of the people alleging it as confirmatory of the loose interpretation of "*suffragium*." But he assumes a chiasm in the passage without warrant, and against the evidence of the preceding part of the epistle. "When a Bishop is once made and approved by the testimony and judgment of his colleagues and the people another can by no means be appointed," (*Oxf. Trans.* p. 99.) Except one word, the rendering is accurate enough: "*Episcopo semel facto, et collegarum ac plebis testimonio et judicio comprobato, alium constitui nullo modo posse*." What warrants the inversion of the writer's order, to make 'testimony' appertain to 'the people' and 'judgment' to the 'colleagues'? But 'comprobatum' is not perfectly rendered by "approved;" and does not apply to the expression of *assent in election*, but to that of consentient approval *after* election. It sends us back a few sentences, to what the writer had already said: "*Gravitati nostri negavimus convenire, ut*

But Dr. Pusey thinks that "even a General Council used" the term "suffrage" loosely "to express glad concurrence of the Laity in the act of Bishops" in the election of Nectarius, during the Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381, (p. 45.) "The Bishops of the Council," says Dr. Pusey, "wrote to the Western Bishops '*We have made Nectarius Bishop, in the Ecumenical Council with common consent, in the presence of the Emperor Theodosius and the whole clergy, and the whole city concurring.*'" This certainly gives the meaning of the Council, but loosely expressed; and the looseness is not in the language of the Council, but in the rendering of a fragment of its statement, isolated from the necessary context. The Council is justifying its own action in filling the three great Sees of Antioch, Constantinople, and Jerusalem, as in accordance with law and usage. "As relates to the administrations locally existing in the Churches, it is, as ye know, both a rule which has been of force from of old, and a decree of the holy fathers in Nice, that in each Eparchy, those of the Eparchy, and if it be their will the neighboring (Bishops) with them, shall conduct the ordinations (*ποιεῖσθαι τὰς χειροτονίας*) as need may be; conformably with which (regulations—*οἷς*) ye know that both the other Churches have been administered by us, and the Priests of the more eminent Churches have been appointed. (*τῶν ἐπισκοπιάτων ἐκκλησιῶν ἀναδεδοῖχθαι τοῖς ἱερεῖς*.) Whence, in the one case, (*μὲν*) of the Church in Constantinople, newly founded, as one may say, which by the mercies of God we have just snatched, as it were from the jaws of the lion, out of the blasphemy of the heretics, *we have ordained Bishop* (*ἐπίσκοπον χειροτονήκαμεν*) the most reverend and beloved of God *Nectarius, in the Ecumenical Council, with common consent, (ἐπὶ τῆς ὁικουμένης συνόδου μετὰ κοινῆς ὁμοφρονίας,) in the presence both of the most religious Emperor Theodosius, and of the whole clergy, (ἐπ' ὀφσεσι καὶ τοῦ βασιλέως, —παντός τε τοῦ κλήρου,) and with the agreeing suffrage of all the city, (πάσης ἐπιψηφισόμενης τῆς πόλεως.)* But in the other case (*δὲ*) of the very ancient and truly Apostolical Church of Antioch in Syria, in which first the honorable name

collegæ nostri jam delecti et ordinati, et laudabili multorum sententia comprobati ventilari—honorem—pateremur." 'We denied that it became our gravity, to suffer the honor of our colleague, already chosen and ordained, and approved by the worthy sentence of many, to be farther canvassed.' (Oxf. Trans. p. 99.) Here are 1, the choice—election—'delecti'; 2, the ordination, 'ordinati'; 3, a subsequent official acquiescence and approval. What that was, is recounted at length in the next letter to Cornelius, on the 'firma et solida auctoritas' of the African Bishops Pompeius and Stephanus, who had officially reported on the subject to their brethren. Closely looked into, it again becomes apparent that the language of St. Cyprian, instead of being loose, is nicely accurate.

of Christians was given, the most reverend and beloved of God bishop, Flavian, was canonically ordained by the assembled (Bishops) of the Eparchy and of the Eastern Diocese, (*συνδραμόντες κανονικῶς ἐχειροτόνησαν*), the whole Church with a consentient vote (*πάσης συμψηφον τῆς ἐκκλησίας*) having as with one voice (*ὡςπερ διὰ μιᾶς φωνῆς*) bestowed the honor on the man, which legitimate ordination was received also (*ἡνπερ ἐνθεσμον χειροτονια ἐδέξατο*) by the common (voice) of the Synod. But as for the (*ὁ δὲ γὰρ*) mother of all the Churches, which is in Jerusalem, of it we acknowledge the most reverend and beloved of God Cyril to be Bishop, (*ἐπισκοπον εἶναι γινώσκουμεν*), both as having been canonically ordained (*κανονικῶς—χειροτονηθέντα*) by those (the Bishops) of the Eparchy of old, and as having undergone much conflict with the Arians in divers places.”*

Three cases are here distinctly reduced to the rules, (1, old custom; 2, the Nicene canon,) conformably with which the Council claims to have proceeded. In the last, the Council certifies that Cyril of Jerusalem had been *canonically ordained* according to the Nicene canon; but as it had been *long ago* (*πάλαι*) they enter into no further particulars; and, therefore, mention is made of nothing but the final action of the *Bishops* of the Eparchy, without allusion to previous procedures in conformity with ‘old custom.’ But in the two other cases, of recent occurrence, both *ordination* and *election* are vindicated, and express claim of ‘the suffrage (*ψῆφος*) of the people’ made in proof of (*ἐνθεσμον χειροτονια*) an ordination legitimate not only according to the canon, but by due observance of the ‘old custom’ also, in either case.† Naturally enough, the case of Nectarius, in which the Council was immediately concerned, is related with more fulness than either of the others. The statement, if the terms and order be duly weighed, is so far from bearing out Dr. Pusey’s views, that it tells strongly against it. It is, in fact, used by De Marca to *prove* the people’s right in election, and justly; though he also uses it to prove the *joint* right of clergy and people, which it does not.

* Ep. Synod. Conc. Const. in Theodoret. Hist. Eccl. V. ix. p. 211, ed. Vales. Conc. Gen. ed. Rom. I. 94, 95.

† How little ground there is for adducing the conciliar use of *συνάρετος* as a mere loose indication of “glad concurrence,” may be perceived by comparing the language afterwards used to describe such “concurrence” when election had really been restricted to the Bishops. In the second Council of Nice, A. D. 787, that restriction was made: *Διὶ—ὅπο ἱεροκόπων ψηφίζεσθαι*. Then when objection was made to Ignatius, as not duly elected to the Patriarchate, answer was made according to Nicetas Paphlago; *Ψῆφω πάντων ὁμοῦ τῶν ἀρχιερέων καὶ τῆς ἐκκλησίας συναίνεσι κανονικῶς καὶ ἐνθέσμως ἐχειροτονησάτω*: that he was ordained canonically and legitimately by the vote of all the Bishops together, and the concurrence of the Church. Citante De Marca, De Conc. S. Imp. et Eccl. VIII. vii. 2. p. 308 ad Baluz.

Nectarius, the Council says, "*we have ordained Bishop*," (1) "in the (Ecumenical synod," *i. e.* as a part of its action and business, (2) and so, as such part of the synodical action "with common consent (or agreement)." That, so resolved upon, was done "in the presence *both* of the emperor *and* of the whole clergy"—an equal share appearing to be assigned to the two parties: but not so of a third—"and with the agreeing suffrage (or vote) of the whole city" (by another rendering—"all the city voting for it.") The order of narration, beginning with the ordination, is here reversed from that of occurrence—first in procedure being last in mention; but for the share of the people, by which 'old use' was duly kept, its own distinct importance is maintained, not undesignedly, by its reservation to the last, as the basis of the whole transaction. Theodoret, it is true, speaks only of the Bishops in the Council as agents in appointing Nectarius. 'Those excellent Pastors,' says he, 'obeying the exhortation' of Gregory Nazianzen, "*ordained* Nectarius Bishop (*ἐπισκοπον χειροτόνησαν*) of the great city." (Eccl. Hist. V. viii. p. 207, C.) But his language conforms with that of the Council, as far as it goes. If we should follow Baronius and Fleury in accepting the romance of Sozomen, indeed, the share of the parties in the transaction would be hardly reconcilable with the Synodical Epistle; the election being represented by him as made by the *Emperor*, out of a list of candidates presented, *at his request and direction*, by the Bishops. (Eccl. Hist. Lib. VII. c. viii.) But Tillemont truly remarks of Sozomen's account, that its own details confute it;† and the irreconcilably different statement of the more judicious Socrates (Eccl. Hist. V. viii.) entirely accords with that of the Council, while it shows how little room there is for Dr. Pusey's gloss upon the language of the latter. The members of the Council, he says, "took counsel concerning the ordination of a Bishop" for Constantinople. (*περὶ χειροτονίας ἐπισκόπου.*) "Now there was one, Nectarius by name—who, having been seized upon *by the people*, was put into the episcopate, (*ἀρπασθεὶς ὑπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ, εἰς τὴν ἐπισκοπήν προεβλήθη.*) the hundred and fifty Bishops then present, ordaining him," (*τῶν—ἐπισκόπων χειροτονήσαντων αὐτόν.* (Vol. 244, vers. ed Steph.) A passage of Domnus of Antioch, preserved by Facundus, (Pro defens. trium Capital. Lib. VIII. c. v. col. 724 B. ed. Migne, Pa-

* Valesius' false translation, by which overlooking the *τε* and *δύσει*, he connects this last clause with that which follows, seems to have been the occasion of de Marca's misemployment of the case.

† "Les circonstances et son rapport le détruisent." Hist. des Emp. Theod. Art. X. Tom. V. p. 212.

trol.) would enable me, not only to weave together the perfectly consistent and accurately expressed accounts of the conciliar Epistle, Theodoret and Socrates; but to combine with them into a coherent and probable narrative, the main outlines of Sozomen's story, too; but it is needless for the present object.

Thus all Dr. Pusey's instances of supposed looseness in the use of words expressing the elective right of the laity, have failed.

The last instance exhibits that right in its most exaggerated exercise. Suggested to "the people" of Constantinople, in all probability, by the Emperor, Nectarius, when offered to the Bishops of the Eparchy for their "judgment," in order to his "ordination" to the Patriarchate, was not even a layman. An unbaptized catechumen was by the decision of the Ecumenical Council, recognized as capable of the "votes" of the "Laiety" and fit to pass the "judgment" of the Bishops. I am not going to press this, though a good deal might be said about it. But strange as it seems to us, the well known case of Ambrose had furnished a precedent, in the other great section of the Church, only a few years before. He too, when only a catechumen, had been raised by the voice of the people to the Episcopate of an Eparchy, second only, if second, in the Western Empire, to that of Rome. The casual cry of an infant 'Ambrose Bishop!' had united on him the voices of conflicting factions whom, as secular magistrate, he was endeavoring to bring to peace and unity in the business for which they were assembled. Unanimous persistence in their sudden choice settled the question of his ordination. A formal report ('relatio') of the choice of the people was made to the Emperor. His joyful approval laid the reluctant object of the people's choice under the necessity of acquiescence. His baptism by a Catholic Bishop followed, as a matter of course; and in eight days more, he had passed through the minor orders, and was admitted to the Episcopate.* Now, what is especially to our purpose in this remarkable transaction, is, that in recording it, the contemporary historians make no observation on the part of the people in the procedure, as at all out of the way, or any assumption of right to the detriment of the Bishops who were to ordain. On the contrary, both Paulinus and Rufinus imply that the mode of election was the usual one, the determination of the person, and the incident by which it was brought about, being the only extraordinary features. Auxen-

* Paulini Vita S. Ambrosii, c. 7, 8, 9. Ruffini Hist. Eccl. II, xi.

tins being dead, "the people" were distracted with party preferences. It was natural, the city being divided between the Arian and Catholic communions. Each had its candidate or candidates. *The people* were assembled in the cathedral to decide who should be ordained. ("Ad ecclesiam—alloqueretur plebem—qui—dissidebant, quia et Ariani sibi, et Catholici sibi, episcopum cupiebant, superatis alterutris, ordinari." Paulin. c. 6.) On all this, the historians have nothing to remark; and no wonder: the history of the fourth and fifth centuries is full of similar occurrences.

Let me exemplify this by one that took place about three years before the election of St. Ambrose, in the East.

When Eunomius the heretic had been ejected from the See of Cyzicus, Demophilus, Patriarch of Constantinople, went thither with other Bishops (*ἐγκαταστήσαι*) to settle a Bishop in the vacant See. He could accomplish nothing, *οὐδὲν περᾶν εἰδέναι*, because the people of the place (*τοὺς ἐν αὐτῇ*) steadfastly persisted in their Homoiousianism. But Demophilus and the other Bishops (*οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ*) having admitted the protest (or appeal—*ἀναδεξαμένους πρόκλησιν*) of the Cyzicenes, and having satisfied them, as the protest (or appeal) required, (*τοῦτο γὰρ ἡ πρόκλησις*;) as to their own orthodoxy, by denouncing publicly by word of mouth and in writing, Eunomius as an Anomoian, and anathematizing his faith and doctrine, are suffered to go on with the ordination, (*ὁρτάσσονται τὴν χειροτονίαν*.) Still the people would allow this to fall upon none but one indicated by *their own votes*, (*οὐκ εἰσὶν οὐδεὶς τινὰ ταύτην εἰλεῖν ἀνασχόμενοι, ἀλλ' ὅν αὐτῶν αἱ ψῆφοι προσέταττον*;) and he, on *being ordained* (*χειροτονηθεὶς*) at once preached the Homo-ousion.

This narrative from Philostorgius,* shows how easily a defective knowledge of details may mislead us into false inferences from particular cases. Had the historian omitted his last sentence, this case would have been clear for Dr. Pusey. As it is, it not only distinctly exemplifies the right of the Laity, first, to secure a pure *source* for the orders of their future Bishops, and then to elect a proper *subject* for the grace, but also remarkably indicates (what our American experience confirms) the conservative value of the laic influence, in holding fast to sound doctrine and ancient discipline.

But to return to St. Ambrose. The language used in narrating his election destroys another of Dr. Pusey's arguments. His repeated emphasis on the notices of a Bishop's being "given" and "granted" to a diocese, "at the petition of the people,"

* Hist. Eccles. IX. xiii. p. 519. s. ed. Vales.

shows how much stress he lays on the fact that it is the customary way of speaking of arrangements for supply of a vacant diocese, to say that the people "*asked a Bishop.*" No doubt that implies the absolute dependence of the Laity upon the Episcopal order for the continuance of the Episcopate; and in any given instance, the power of the Bishops having jurisdiction in the premises, to refuse coöperation for supply of the vacant See, and withhold ordination from one in their judgment unfit for its reception, by whomsoever recommended, or howsoever elected.

A case in point occurs to me, having several features of resemblance to that of St. Ambrose, which it preceded by about twelve years.

At Cæsarea, the metropolis of Cappadocia Prima, the Bishops of the province were convened for the consecration of a successor to the Exarchate on the death of Diancus, A. D. 362. 'The people were divided,' says Gregory Nazianzen, who gives us the account;* 'some proposing one, some another, some even following the inclinations of private friendship, as is wont in such matters.' At last all agreed on Eusebius, one of the first men of the city, of unblemished life, but only a catechumen. They carried him off by force, helped by the soldiery, took him to the chief church, and presented him to the Bishops assembled for the election, asking them to baptize and ordain him. The Bishops demurred; the multitude at first entreated and then threatened; at last the Bishops gave way, baptized Eusebius, and then ordained and enthroned him; all under personal fear from the violence of the people. When restored to liberty, the majority of the Bishops were for declaring what they had done null and void, because it was done under constraint. Gregory of Nazianzum the elder, (father of the narrator,) was of a different mind. He held that they owed it to Eusebius, who had been as much constrained as they, not to degrade him; *they had done wrong in ceding* to the violence of the people, but *their* wrong was not to be remedied by punishing Eusebius. His opinion prevailed. The thing, when reported to the Emperor, displeased him as much as the Bishops, though for different reasons; and under instructions from the Emperor, the Governor of the Province insisted on the displacement of the new Exarch, accused the people of sedition in what they had done, and menaced the Bishops if they should refuse to undo their work by deposing Eusebius.

* Orat. XIX. Fleury, Hist. Eccl. XV, xiii. To. IV. p. 30. Baronius. Ann. IV. 27, C. D. ed. Rom.

The wise-hearted and stout old Bishop of Nazianzum opposed him, too, successfully. Admitting that the Bishops had done wrong, in acting as they had, he maintained that the thing done *was according to the canons* and agreeable to the Lord, and utterly denied the right of the civil authority to interfere. His judgment, you see, agreed with that of the Council of Constantinople, as to the conformity of the right of the people, even in its extremest exercise, with the canons of the Church. In this instance, the Bishops 'gave' what they ought not, because the 'asking' of the people had been both in an improper manner, and for a subject in their judgments unfit.

That the 'asking' implied nothing more than this, appears from the whole tenor of the narrative. So in the case of St. Ambrose, the language of Paulinus shows that the very business of the people in a vacant See, was to 'ask' a *Bishop*, the petition being for the gift of orders to the person whom they might choose, not for the bestowal upon them of any particular individual as a nominee for their acceptance. "*Cum populus ad seditionem surgeret in petendo episcopo,*"—'the people got into a sedition in the business of *asking a Bishop.*' And so, the Emperor hearing of the choice, was greatly pleased that the person whom he had made a magistrate, "*ad sacerdotium peteretur,*" 'was asked for the Priesthood'—plainly, was propounded to the Bishops, for their bestowal upon him of the holy office.

The phrase is perfectly explained by St. Ambrose himself, in a letter to the Church of Vercelli. Condoling with that Church, a metropolitan See, on account of its long vacancy, he expresses his grief "*quia Ecclesia Domini quæ est in vobis, sacerdotem non habet, ac—eget officio, quod ex ea aliæ sibi Ecclesiæ petere solebant*"—'because the Church of the Lord among them is still without a priest, and—needs that same good office which *other Churches* have been wont to *ask of her,*' viz: the supply of a Bishop. There can be no doubt that not the nomination of a person, but the impartation of the gift of orders to supply a vacant office, is what was here in question, as between Church and Church. But when St. Ambrose goes on to upbraid them with their *dissensions*, which hinder "*aut nos decernere, aut vos eligere, aut quisquam acquiescere, ut inter dissidentes suscipiat hoc munus,*"—'us (Bishops) from resolving on anything and *you from electing,* and any one from consenting to take the office among a people so dissenting,' and exhorts them "*ut congruatis assensu ad postulandum sacerdotem*"—'to agree together in uniting to *ask* for a Bishop,' it leaves no more room for question, that the election by the people of some one to prevent for ordination, was the mode of "*asking*" for a Bishop ;

the approval of the choice, and consent to ordain, the mode of his being "given" by the metropolitan and com-provincial Bishops. St. Ambrose, too, urges on them the example of the Vercellenses of former times, 'qui sanctum Eusebium, quem nunquam ante cognoverant, posthabitis civibus, simul ut viderunt et probaverunt quem *omnis elegit Ecclesia*: merito creditum quod divina *esset electus* iudicio, quem *omnes postulavissent*;' without previous knowledge of Eusebius, they had approved of him as soon as they saw him, in preference to their own citizens; and he was *elected by the whole Church*, and the *election* rightly deemed Providential, inasmuch as *all had asked* for him.*

The sense of "asking," wherever it occurs concerning the consecration of a Bishop, comes very clearly out in the sixth Sardinian canon, on comparison of the Greek and old Latin forms: τὰ δὲ πλὴθὴ συναθροισθέντα παρακαλοῦσιν γίνεσθαι τὴν κατὰ-τασιν τοῦ παρ' αὐτῶν ἐπιζητουμένου ἐπισκόπου, 'if the assembled people desire that the settlement of the Bishop sought by them should take place,' which the parallel Latin version in the Roman edition,† renders "*congregata populi multitudo suadeat et instet ut fiat institutio Episcopi, qui ab eis postulatur*;" the 'Antiquissima Versio' from the Vatican published by the Balzerini‡ "*plebs autem conveniens roget fieri ordinationem Episcopi*."

And further on in the same Canon, the sense of "giving"—keeping the connexion in mind—becomes equally manifest. The absentee Bishop whose neglect the Canon is providing for, is to be admonished concerning the vacant See, ὅτι ἀξίω τὰ πλὴθὴ ποιμένα αὐτοῖς δοῦναι, that *the people* asks to have a pastor *given* to it, that is, to have an ordination take place.

If more evidence were needed in explanation of the mutual relations of "the people" of a vacant See in *asking*, and the assembled Provincial Bishops in *giving*, the needed Bishops, I should be tempted by its satisfactory fullness to go a little beyond the limits of Dr. Pusey's field of examination, and adduce a passage from a letter of Leo the Great to the Bishops of the Province of Vienne. "Let those who are to be advanced to the Episcopate *be asked* in peace and quietness. Let there be furnished a subscription of the Clergy, a testimonial from the persons of honor, the agreement of the men of rank and of the people: let him who is to be set over all, be chosen by all. The ordination let each metropolitan in his own prov-

* Ambrosii Epis. lxiii. ed. Bened. Opp. Tom. II. p. 1023.

† Conc. Gen. Pauli Vaut. Romæ, 1608. Tom. I. p. 44 B.

‡ Opp. Leonis Magni. App. 591.

ince claim for himself, together with the seniors among his Bishops." Here (1,) *asking* ('*postulentur*') is the whole process; then (2) its two divisions are, the election ('*eligatur*') and the *ordination* ('*ordinationem*;)') and (3) the election is to be *by all over whom* the elect is to be set, the laity making up three classes out of four, whose separate action is required. All this is indicated, not as an innovation, but as a return from innovations to the old time-honored practice of the universal Church; and it was so.* It is a sore trial to leave this Gallican ground, once entered; for never was richer harvest than the discussions between Zosimus, Cælestine, Leo and Hilary of Rome, and the Bishops of Southern Gaul afford to the vindicator of the rights of the Laity in the election of Bishops. But to go into it would be to send you a book instead of a letter.

I find, indeed, that before I have fairly taken up my notes for comment upon Dr. Pusey's episodical discussion, I have drawn largely on your patience and approached the limits of its reasonable extent.

Yet Dr. Pusey's use of language employed in the Council of Chalcedon (p. 45) to support his view of the *donation* to a See of the Bishop to be set over it by electing Bishops, is an irresistible inducement to look at some of the evidence to the contrary afforded by the Acts of that same Council. The case adduced by Dr. P. is that of the metropolitan of Ephesus, of which he finds the Council holding that one "who had the suffrages (*ψηφισθέντων*) of all whose shepherd he is to be, should rule the Church;"† and that "there shall be *given* to the metropolis of Ephesus, as Bishop, one pointed out by God, and having the suffrages (*ψηφισθέντος*) of all over whom he is to be shepherd, to be ordained by the Church there;"‡ and yet in one of its members, expressing the opinion, that "The Bishops of the Province know most about them, [the two Bishops who had, as rivals, been uncanonically intruded into the See;] so let them say, according to their reverence and awe of God, who ought to have the See of Ephesus." From this we are to infer that the Provincial Bishops were to settle the question who was to have the See; therefore, that the person of their choice would be *given* to the diocese; therefore that "the suffrages"

* Per pacem et quietem sacerdotes qui prefuturi sunt sunt *postulentur*. Teneant subscriptio clericorum *honoratorum* testimonium, *ordinis consensus, et plebis*: qui *prefuturus* est omnibus, ab omnibus *eligatur*. Ordinationem sibi singuli metropolitani suarum provinciarum, cum his qui cæteros sacerdotii antiquitate præveniunt—defendant." Conc. Gal. To. I. p. 83. aliter Opp. Leon. M. ed. Ballerin. To. I. p. 639.

† "Act. 12. Conc. iv. 1624."

‡ "Act. 11. p. 1617, 20."

of those over whom he should so be made shepherd, could only signify consent and approval, not election. It is obvious to remark that this being a case of contested claim of rival occupants of the See, the part of the Provincial Bishops in selecting one of them would only be to judge of and ratify a *previous election* by the people, pretended alike in either case. It may also be remarked, (and the remark applies to nearly every case adduced by Dr. Pusey,) that a metropolitan See differs from an ordinary Bishopric, in that, under Leo's maxim, "qui præfuturus est omnibus, ab omnibus eligatur," the com-provincial Bishops have a direct interest in the election of their future superior, and might reasonably, therefore, be expected to interfere to an extent not warranted in the addition to their number of a mere co-equal colleague. But leaving the case, with these remarks, to be set in comparison with those of Cyzicus, Cæsarea, Milan, and Vercelli, (all metropolitan,) let us see whether the records of this same Council do not furnish fuller and clearer evidence of the mode of filling metropolitan Sees, than those fragments of opinions of its members?

In the Sixteenth Session, in the discussion that grew out of the proposed Act recognizing patriarchal supervision of the Eparchies of Pontus, Asia, and Thrace on the part of the See of Constantinople, after the representatives of the Roman See had made their objections, and the Bishops who signed the proposed Act had severally denied their imputation of constraint, the small minority that had dissented, being called on by the Judges, who, on the part of the Emperor, administered the civil authority in the Synod, for their reasons:

"Eusebius, Bishop of Ancyra, said: 'I have my word to say, and that without meaning any prejudice to the proposal of the generality. That I am quite free from any desire to ordain,* I have shown by my acts. The Holy Bishop who just now attested his subscription, [Peter, metropolitan of Gangra,] and the one before him, I ordained. For *all the city* (*ἡ πόλις ἡ πᾶσα*) came to me to Ancyra, and *they brought the suffrages*, (*τα ψηφίσματα*, viz., the act, *δόγμα*, *decretum*,† attesting

* *Χειροτονεῖν*: that is, to give official confirmation to, and preside at, the ordination of Metropolitan Bishops within the Eparchy of which his was the chief metropolis; which it was now proposed to make the duty of the Patriarch of Constantinople, by the new Act.

† "Fiet a sacerdotibus, clero et populo, *decretus*." Ordo Romanus VIII. in App. ad Opp. Gregor. Magni. (Curs. Patrol. Migne. LXXVIII. 1001. D.) "*Decretum, sine Visitoris presentia nemo conficiat, ejus testimonio clericorum ac civium possit unanimitas declarari.*" Symmachus Ep. Rom. (A. 498-514.) Forms used in the election of Boniface V. of Rome, (Ao. 617,) and later, amply

the election by the votes of the people and clergy,) I answered them, saying: I am not one of those who desire to ordain. They reminded me how their former Bishops had been ordained by the Bishop of Ancyra, one, two, three. I said, whatsoever you may say to me, I will not throw myself into a dispute. [*Viz:* to assert the privilege of his See in the case, against Constantinople.] After that they come and apply to the blessed Proclus, (the late Patriarch of Constantinople.)

"And as he (Eusebius) was saying this," the Acts go on, "Philip, the presbyter of the Church at Constantinople, said: 'Thy piety (your reverence) wrote concerning Callinicus, but according to what thy piety now says, the blessed Proclus ordained Peter.'

"Eusebius, of Ancyra, said: 'The blessed one sent letters to me; I ordained him. All this is not empty talk, but in proof of my predisposition in this matter, that after this I may bring in my wishes, and what I have to say upon such points as I have to notice. I went to Gangra; I enthroned the Bishop, (*ἐνεθρόνισα τον ἐπισκοπον.*) So it fell out, that he died within a few days. Again, *all those of the city* (*πάντες οἱ τῆς πόλεως*) coming to me, besought me to make another Bishop, (*παρεκάλουν, ὥστε ποιῆσαι.*) 'I answer you (said I) the same now, (as before,) I do not desire to ordain.' They, seeing my resolution in the matter, went to Constantinople, and took thither the lord Peter, who just now gave his attestation. Let these things, then, serve for proof of my resolution, and that I have no desire to ordain. But I intreat that the cities may not have to pay (the expenses) on account of ordination. For when *they who are elected by the city*, (*οἱ ψηφιζόμενοι παρὰ τῆς πόλεως*), having been approved by the Synod of the Province, (*παρὰ τῆς συνόδου τῆς πόλεως τὴν ἐπαρχίαν δοκιμαζόμενοι*), are ordained in the cities themselves, the expenses are paid by the (Church) funds. This I know by experience, for they had a heavy burden to pay off on account of him who was before me.'

"Philip, the presbyter, said: 'That is done away by the canon.* That is taken away by the laws and the canon. The altar is pure.'

exemplifying the share the laity then had in election, may be found in the *Liber Diurnus Romanorum Pontificum*, compiled in 718. The exact "*scriptio laicorum*" occurs there, (ed. Garnier. in *Curs. Patrol. To. CV. repetit. c. 33.*) It is called "*decretales paginæ*" (ibid. *Ad Jud. Ravennæ*, col. 38 A.) and "*solenne decretum subscriptione omnium roboratum*." (ibid. *Ad Apocris. Rav.* col. 38. C.)

* Canon II of the Council of Chalcedon, forbidding payments on account of ordination.

"Eusebis, of Ancyra, said: 'By the favor of God the reputation of the most holy Archbishop Anatolius is untarnished; but no one is immortal.'

"Anatolius, Bishop of Constantinople, said: 'By whom wast thou thyself ordained?'

"Eusebis said: 'By my misfortune I was found here, (i. e., at Constantinople, opposite to Chalcedon, across the strait;) and was ordained by the blessed Proclus.'

"Thalassius, Bishop of Cæsarea, (the Exarch of the whole Eparchy proposed to be put under Constantinople,) said: 'Let us go to the Lord Archbishop Anatolius; and so decree it.'

"The most glorious Judges said: 'As the result of what has been done, and of the attested opinions of each, let us decree, first of all that the primary and chief honor, according to the canons, is to be preserved to the Archbishop, beloved of God, of the elder Rome—but that the most holy Archbishop of the royal Constantinople, the new Rome, ought to enjoy the same honorable precedence, and have himself of his own right power to ordain the metropolitans in the Dioceses of Asia, Pontus, and of Thrace, after this sort: that of each metropolis the clergy, and the proprietors (*κτιτόρων*) and the men of rank (*καὶ λαμπροτάτων ἀνδρῶν*) and moreover all the reverend Bishops in the Province, or the majority of them, shall elect (*ψηφίσσθαι*) and choose (*ἐπιλέγασθαι*) whomsoever the aforesaid (*οἱ προειρημένοι*) shall approve (*δοκιμάσουσιν*) as worthy to be Bishop of the Church in the metropolis; but that it shall be referred by all the electors (*παρὰ πάντων τῶν ἐπιλεξαμένων*) to the most holy Archbishop of the royal Constantinople, to rest with him whether he choose to have the elect (*τὸν ἐπιλεγόμενον*) brought hither (to Constantinople) to be ordained; or whether by precept from him (*κατ' ἐπιτροπὴν αὐτοῦ*) he (the elect) shall receive the office of the episcopate in the Province, (*τῇ ψήφῳ τῆς ἐπισκοπῆς τυχεῖν*;) but as for the holy Bishops in the several cities, they shall be ordained by all, or the majority, of the reverend Bishops of the province, the metropolitan having the ultimate approval (*τὸ κρίμα ἔχοντος τοῦ μετροπολίτου*) according to the canon of the fathers that is before us,* and the most holy Archbishop of Constantinople having no participation in the ordinations of those Bishops. This is the way the matter stands in our view: but let the holy and Œcumenical Synod be pleased to instruct us how it presents itself to it.'

* Τὸν κείμενον: that already alleged in the discussion of the case; viz. the 6th of Nice, as re-inforced in the 2d of Constantinople; both of which had been read and laid on the table of the Council.

"The reverend Bishops cried out: 'That is the right vote.' 'That we all say.' 'That pleases all.' 'That is a just decision.' 'Let it stand decreed.' 'That is a right vote.' 'All things are duly decreed.' 'We pray, dismiss us,' &c." *

The concluding portion of this decree, as drawn up by the lay-assessors, and accepted by the Bishops, is a remarkable proof how little reliance can be placed on supposed evidence against the rights of the Laity in election derived from a pre-termission of mention of those rights in any canon regulating ordination.

The difference between the expressions used concerning the ordination of simple Bishops and those employed with reference to the case of metropolitans might lead to the supposition that the full rights of the Laity in the election of a metropolitan, so distinctly recognized, did not exist in the case of an inferior see; the concern of Bishops only, in such case, being regulated by the decree.

But an incidental production of evidence in the discussion of a case of contested metropolitan rights brought before this same Council, shows that such supposition would be false; and that the same process was pursued with regard to the metropolitan in the case of a suffragan Bishop as the Council required to be observed with regard to the Patriarch of Constantinople in the case of election of a metropolitan in the Eparchies concerned in the decree.

Nicæa had been raised to the civil dignity of a metropolis by one of the Valentinians. It had before been under Nicomedia, metropolis of Bithynia.

A country town formerly dependant on Nicæa, had, before this elevation of the latter, been made a city. The Bishop of Nicæa claimed it as his suffragan See, when the imperial decree made his city a metropolis.

The Archbishop of Nicomedia opposed his claim. They brought the case before the Council. Each was put to produce his proofs of jurisdiction over Basileopolis.

The Bishop of Nicæa alleged that his predecessor had ordained a Bishop for it.

The Archbishop of Nicomedia answered that this had been done surreptitiously, or during a vacancy of the metropolitanical See. For his part, he said: 'I show the votes (*ψηφισματα*; the *δογμα* or *decretum* attesting the result of voting at an election) of the Basileopolitans, wherein they applied for a Bishop:

* Conc. Chalcedon, Act. xvi. vera. fin. Concil. General ed. Roman. Tom. II. pp. 428—431.

(παρεκάλεισαν περί επισκόπου) do thou show where they applied to the Nicæans to give them a Bishop, (παρεκάλεισαν Νικαίαις, ὥστε δοῦναι αὐτοῖς ἐπισκόπον.)⁵

Now it is especially observable that this application to “give a Bishop” could not have been to a synod, as the Bishop of Nicæa never claimed to have more suffragans than the one of the city in question. “Give,” therefore, would not in such case have meant, elect by vote of a synod. Nor was the application supposed to have been to the Bishop alone, but “to the Nicæans,” that is, to the whole church. But if made to them, it could only have been as made to the Archbishop, in the form of a certificate of ψηφίσματα, votes electing a certain person, and asking approval and consent, in order to his ordination by Bishops called together for the purpose.

This discussion, then, affords positive evidence what “votes” and “asking” do mean; and what “giving a Bishop” does not mean. It clinches all the conclusions drawn from a re-examination of the supposed inferential proof alleged by Dr. Pusey.

We are now enabled to go to a dictum of Celestine, Bishop of Rome, A. D. 428, quoted (from his Ep. 2, ad Episc. Gall. 5 c. 5) in part by Dr. Pusey, (p. 41,) and find in it, when given entire, exactly the reverse of what the portion of it is supposed to indicate. “Nullus invitis detur Episcopus” furnishes to Dr. Pusey the inference, “The Bishop was ‘given to the People,’ not chosen by them; yet he was not to be forced upon them, if unwilling.”

“Nullus invitis detur Episcopus; cleri, plebis et ordinis consensus ac desiderium requiratur” is what I find in the original epistle of Celestine.† It affords me, as read by the light of the foregoing evidence; (1.) the ordination of a Bishop implied in “detur;” (2.) the ‘petitio episcopi’ “asking” for an ordination, also implied in “detur;” (3.) the provision of a person to be so ordained, implied in “requiratur”—by whom? by the ordaining Bishops: of whom? of the petitioning people, diocese or church: for whom? for the object of their choice, on account of whom they make their petition, in order to his obtaining ordination which will give them, in him, a Bishop; (4.) the election, in order to such provision, implied in ‘consensus et desiderium’—not ‘consensus’ alone, but an agreeing desire of some one person; (5.) the participation of the Laity, both people and men of rank, ‘plebis et ordinis’ together with the Clergy, in such election. Do I find more than our previously

* Concil. Gen. ed. Rom. II. 387, 388.

† Concil. Gallican, I, 57.

examined authorities abundantly bear me out in assuming to be there?

This introduction of Celestine, (A. D. 428,) and his distinct mention of classes of the Laity as severally participating in the election, induce me to go a little back in tracing both the testimony of the great See of Rome to the Catholic usage in this matter, and also, the progress of what certainly was an innovation in its form.

Siricius, Bishop of Rome, A. D. 385,* explicitly asserts the agency of the clergy and laity in raising the object of their choice to the episcopate. Tracing the course of one in lower orders, somewhat in the spirit of our last Collect in "The Ordering of Deacons"—"that they may be found worthy to be called unto the higher ministries in thy Church"—he says: "Exinde jam accessu temporum, presbyterum vel episcopatum, si eum cleri ac plebis edecumavit electio, non immerito sortitur." "In process of time he may not undeservedly attain to the Presbyterate or the Episcopate, if *the election of the clergy and people pick him out for it.*" Could a Bishop in the United States express his hopes for his newly ordained deacon otherwise?

If a commentary on the language of the Roman Bishop were needed, it might be obtained from his contemporary St. Jerome. "The Church," says he, "often elects a watchman [he is commenting on the portion of Ezekiel used for a Lesson in our Institution Office] from the last among her people. The watchman of the Church, whether Bishop or Presbyter, *because he is chosen by the people*, by the study of the Scriptures knowing and foreseeing what is to come to pass, must announce it to the people, and correct delinquents. Whence it is greatly to be dreaded lest we approach this duty being unworthy of it, and *being taken by the people*, give ourselves up to negligence and indolence."† A controversial purpose leads this same unimpeachable witness to testify still more fully to the fact of the election of Bishops by the people, while descanting upon some of its evil consequences. "The election of a Bishop itself, makes for me. That married men are elected to the Priesthood, I do not deny: because more

* Ep. ad Himer, c. x. n. 14, ed. Coustant.

† "Ecclesia—sæpe de novissimis populi sui speculatorem eligit.—Speculator—Ecclesiæ, vel episcopus, vel presbyter, *quia a populo electus est*, et Scripturarum lectione cognoscens, et prævidens quæ futura sint annuntiet populo, et corrigat delinquentem. Unde magnopere formidandum est, ne ad hoc officium accedamus indigni, et *assumpti a populo*, negligentie nos demus atque desidie." Opp. V. 395, 396. ed. Benedict.

Priests are needed, than there are single men.—It happens sometimes that a severe style of dress, bent brows and a funeral gait *offend the people*, and having nothing to find fault with in the life, it vents its odium on the dress and walk. *Many are elected*, not out of love of them, but out of hatred of some other. Most frequently *votes are gained* by mere candor, which is contrasted by prudence and finesse on the other side, as if that were wickedness. Sometimes *the judgment of the people and the commonalty* errs, and in judging of the characters of Priests *each decides in favor of his own disposition, so as to seek*, not so much one that is good, as one that is like himself, *to be a prelate*. It happens sometimes, that in *preferring* a married man to a single one, *the married men, who make up the majority of the people*, are in fact as it were passing an encomium on their own condition.* Can anything describe more clearly than this a popular election with all its features? Can anything be more irreconcilable with the hypothesis that in those days Dioceses received their Bishops *by gift* from the Synod of assembled Bishops? I wish I had time and room to append to Jerome's graphic querimony the curious and amusingly naive enumeration made by Sidonius Apollinaris, Bishop of Clermont, in an address to the Church of Bourges, of the difficulties he found in making choice of a Bishop to suit the people, who by express vote had left it to him to fill their See.† Some of our vacant Dioceses might think themselves described; although I doubt whether any could be found to act so wisely.

But to return to the practice of the Roman See. The contested election of Boniface I, in 418, led to the address of a formal memorial to the Emperor by the Clergy who supported him. Vindicating their choice, and the way in which it had been effected, they describe what were admitted requisites of legitimate procedure. "*We*," they say, (the writers are the "Roman Presbyters,") "after the death of the holy Zosimus, as usage required, and the very discipline of religion dictated, *assembled* together several Priests, (i. e. Bishops,) that *we*

* *Ipsa episcopalis electio mecum facit.*—Eliguntur mariti in sacerdotium, non nego: quia non sunt tanti virgines, quanti necessarii sunt sacerdotes.—Evenit interdum, ut tristior cultus, adductum supercilium, incessus pomparum ferculis similis, *offendat populum*, et quia nihil habet quod reprehendat in vita, habitum solum oderit et incessum. *Multi eliguntur* non amore sui, sed alterius odio. In plerisque *suffragium meretur* sola simplicitas, et alterius prudentiæ et calliditati quasi malitiæ opponuntur. Nonnunquam *errat plebis vulgique* iudicium, et in sacerdotibus comprobantur, *unusquisque suis moribus facit*, ut non tam bonum, quam sui similem *querat propositum*. Evenit aliquoties, ut mariti, *quæ pars major in populo est*, maritis quasi sibi applaudant—si maritum virgini *preferant*." Adv. Jovinian. l. xxxiv. Opp. ed. Ben. II. 291, 292.

† A. D. 472. Sidonii Concio in Concil. Gallican. l. 144, s. Epist. ad Perpetuum (Lib. vii, Ep. 9.) Ibid. 143

might consult, in the exercise of the common judgment, for the appointment of a successor. We convened, by notice given to all, at the same Church where before all had been assembled: and there, in joint counsel with the Christian people, we elected one marked out by the Divine precepts, (quem Deus jussit.) For we secured the venerable man Boniface, an old Presbyter, very learned in the law and of tried good character, and what still more recommended him, himself unwilling, by the acclamation of the whole people and consent of the principal men of the city, for consecration to the divinely instituted order, (adscivimus divinæ institutionis ordine consecratum.) For it is certain that the benediction was celebrated at a suitable time, with the subscriptions of seventy Presbyters, more or less, and the assistance (adstantibus) of nine Bishops of various Provinces; and all previous solemnities, required by use, were duly fulfilled. These allegations show that it was then universally understood and admitted that the established usage and discipline required in the case of a vacancy, the initiative by the Clergy of the vacant Diocese; the presence of comprovincial Bishops to make further proceedings valid; the assemblage of the whole Church, Clergy and Laity; and the nomination of candidates for ordination by the votes of the people and principal men, and the subscriptions of the Clergy. As there were Clergy, Laity and Bishops on both sides, and both candidates were ordained, the authority of the Emperor was invoked to decide to whom the See rightfully belonged. He took measures to convoke a Council; but before the final judgment of the Bishops could be obtained, the opponent of Boniface, by his own misconduct, forfeited his claim, and no opponent remaining, the sole lawful claimant was recognized by the Emperor, and the summons of the Council of Bishops from all Italy, Gaul and Africa, revoked. The correspondence on the subject occupies ten folio pages of Baronius,† throughout which, the distinction between the question of *fact*, as to which candidate was duly elected, and the question of *right*, as to which was rightfully ordained, is kept clearly and steadily in view.*

Had there been merely rival *elections*, the principle on which the assembled Bishops of the Eparchy *ought* to have acted, (and on which the Council of the whole civil diocese summoned by Honorius, *must* have acted, had its action been final,) is clearly laid down by Leo I, in entire conformity with the

* Epistola Romanorum Presbyterorum ad Honorium Imperatorem, inter Epistolis S. Bonifacii I. Papæ Epist. I. Cura. Patrologiæ, Migne. To. XX. col. 750.

† Annales Ao. 419. Tom. V, pp. 429-440, ed. Rom.

claims of the Roman Presbyters, as made twenty-six years before he wrote.* He asserts both the indispensableness and the entire freedom of election by the clergy and people. "When the election of a Bishop is under discussion, he *must be preferred* before all, *whom the consent of the clergy and of the people shall have asked*, with agreement: provided, that if the votes shall have been divided, and part given to some other person, then preference shall be given, according to the judgment of the metropolitan, to that one who shall be recommended by the largest support and greatest merit; only that no one shall be ordained for a people unwilling and not asking; lest the city either contemn or hate a Bishop not desired by it; and become less religious than is fitting, through not being allowed to have the person whom it would."† This rule makes an affirmative expression of the popular will a necessary preliminary to ordination; and accordingly Leo goes on to instruct Anastasius, as Exarch, to require of the metropolitan a report both as to the fitness of the Bishop elect, and as to the *fact of his election* by the clergy and people, before he gives his sanction to the ordination, as due and proper.‡ The direction for the settlement of a metropolitan is, if possible, even still more explicitly to the point. "The provincial Bishops ought to assemble at the metropolitan city, in order that by the ascertainment of *the will of all the clergy and of all the citizens*, the best of the Presbyters or of the deacons of the same Church *may be elected*, whose name the provincial Bishops should report to the Exarch, ready to *fulfill the votes of those who ask for him*, when they shall have ascertained that the Exarch also is satisfied with that which has been satisfactory to them."§ As the Exarch, so the provincial Bishops, have

* Leonis Magni Epist. XIV. (ed. Ballerin. al. XII.) ad Anast. Thessal. c. v. copied into the Decretum Gratiani. Dist. 63. c. ult.

† The sense is as above; but it is hard to bring out, without too much indulgence in paraphrase, the full bearing of the original on the question before us. Almost every word might be commented on, to the purpose. "Cum ergo de summi sacerdotis electione tractabitur, ille omnibus præponatur quem cleri plebisque consensus concorditer postularit: ita ut si in aliam forte personam partium se vota dividerint, metropolitani iudicio is alteri præferatur qui majoribus et studiis juvatur et meritis: tantum ut nullus invitis et non petentibus ordinetur; ne civitas episcopum non optatum aut contemnat aut oderit; et fiat minus religiosa quam convenit, cui non licuerit habere quem voluit."

‡ De persona autem consecrandi episcopi, et de cleri plebisque consensu—referat;—ut ordinationem rite celebrandam tua quoque firmet auctoritas." Ibid. c. vi.

§ "—ut omnium clericorum atque omnium civium voluntate discussa—optimus eligatur, de cuius nomine—referant sacerdotes, impleturi vota poscentium, cum quod ipsis placuit, tibi quoque placuisse cognoverint." Ibid. c. vi. n. 2, p. 688, 689. ed. Ball. Decret. Gratiani. Dist. 63. cap. 19.

only to pronounce upon the fitness of a person whose name is laid before them, as that on which the wills of the clergy and laity of the city are agreed, and for which the *gift* of ordination, and by the performance of that necessary rite, of a Bishop for the city, is *asked*. You perceive how completely this bears out what was remarked, above, on the question of metropolitical ordinations, as it came up in the Council of Chalcedon, with which this evidence of St. Leo is contemporary. East and West agree exactly, each contributing some detail to supply the deficiency of the other.

I had intended to bring down the chain of Roman evidence to the time of Gregory the Great, and adduce a few of the many noticeable cases which his correspondence furnishes; (more than one in which he recognizes, as valid and sufficient, elections of Bishops made *by laity alone*; and one* in which as Exarch he requests a layman, the Judge of Campania, to convocate "*priores vel populum civitatis, ut de electione alterius cogitatis*"—the chief persons of a city, to take order for an election;) but I am passing all reasonable limits. Allowing myself to be led, by connection of points as they severally rose, from case to case, I have regularly examined but a small portion of Dr. Pusey's argument. My position would be continually strengthened by going on with a thorough investigation of the remainder. Much lies before me in my notes, as satisfactory as anything that has been adduced, and for its variety of bearings on the question, likely to add greatly to the degree of conviction which the evidence already given may have sufficed to produce. But I cannot think it necessary to detain you longer. Indeed, nothing but the apparently perfect confidence in his cause of such a scholar as Dr. Pusey, and the transparent candor and earnest piety which lend a weight to his advocacy of it not at all belonging to the array of facts or argument presented, could have justified me in writing at such length against a view held in opposition to some of the very chiefest authorities in such questions.

That great light and glory of our branch of the Church, Bishop Andrewes, says, in refutation of Bellarmine, that "*It is false, that in the age of Cyprian (then when the Church was yet under the cross) the votes of the people did not intervene, and therefore Bishops were not selected for office by such votes. That practice lasted long after Cyprian's time, and might well be allowed as a consolation to the people groaning under the cross and hourly expecting death, and therefore*

* Epist. XV. Lib. III. Indict. xi.

religiously careful to elect the very best man for the office.”* The whole of Dr. Pusey’s argument from Cyprian and Origen, that ‘the new Bishop was chosen not *by* but *in the presence of* the people,’ he sets aside in a single sentence. “The ‘presence of’ the people in Cyprian includes their testimony concerning the life, but it does not exclude their vote for the person.”†

“Yea,” says Francis Mason, the learned vindicator of Anglican orders, “the suffrages of the people are a thing so clearly set downe in antiquitie, that *Pamelius* himselfe cannot deny them: ‘Wee deny not (saith hee) the olde rite of electing Bishops, by which they are wont to bee chosen, the people being present, yea rather by the voyces of the people; for that it was obserued in Africk, is evident by the election of Eradius, the successor of S. Austin, concerning which there is extant his 110 Epistle; in Greece in the age of Chrysostome, as appeareth by his third booke of Priesthood; in Spaine by this place of Cyprian, and Isidor in his booke of Offices; in France by the epistle of Celestinus; at Rome by those things which were spoken before upon the epistle to Antonianus; yea everywhere else by the 87 Epistle of Leo; and that this custome continued untill Gregory the first appeareth by his Epistles; yea, even unto the times of the Emperours Charles and Lodowick, as it is manifest enough out of the first booke of their Chapters;’ and the same *Pamelius* in another place saith: ‘The manner of chusing the Bishop of Rome was often changed; first Saint Peter chose his successours Linus, Cletus, and Clemens; then Anacletus and the rest unto the second Schisme betweene Damasus and Ursicinus, were created by the suffrages of the clergie and the people.’ Behold how *Pamelius*, who a little before interpreted the peoples elections in Cyprian, as though they elected onely by way of testimonie (a colde and a hungry interpretation) is now forced to confesse (O the evidence of trueth) that they *electd by way of suffrage*; yea, and that the Roman Bishops from Anacletus to Damasus, (that is, from the yeere 103 to the yeere 307, [l. 370]) were so elected. Wherefore it is most true which is affirmed by our

* “Peræque vero falsum—Cypriani sæculo (tum cum esset adhuc sub *Cruce* Ecclesia, *suffragia plebis* non intervenisse, adeoque Episcopos eorum calculis allectos non fuisse. Nam id diu post durasse. Et id quidem *populo* permitti tum poterat in solatium sub *cruce* gementi, in horas singulas mortem expectanti, cui proin religio summa optimum quemque deligendi.” Ad Cardinalis Bellarmini Apologiam Responsio. p. 313. (Oxf. ed. p. 433.)

† “Præsentia quidem plebis, apud Cyprianum, includit *Testimonium de vita*, nec excludit *suffragium de persona*.” Ibid.

learned Bishop, 'Presentia plebis,' &c.,” quoting Bishop Andrewes, as above.*

“Let those know that they err,” says the incontestably learned and able De Dominis, “who consider that of old the part of the people consisted only in rendering testimony of the life and manners of the candidate.”† In a whole chapter of his great work, through more than thirty closely printed folio pages, he maintains, with a solid and well digested mass of learning, the right and practice of the Laity to exercise “a judicial and effective power, by way of proper suffrage and election” in the appointment of Bishops, throughout the first eight centuries, in every portion of the Church.

Bingham (whose language in describing the position of Andrewes and Mason I have just been using) with his usual happiness of method, fills the second chapter of his Fourth Book with a selection from the evidence of the judicial and elective power of the Laity in the election of a Bishop.‡

Pearson adds to the same side the weight of his wonderfully accurate learning and critical acuteness. He confutes by anticipation Dr. Pusey’s argument from the Synodical letter of Egyptian Bishops concerning the election of St. Athanasius, by showing that at Alexandria, *as in other Churches*, the people had their share in the election of the Bishop, and that “indeed the Bishops of Alexandria seem, from the most ancient times, to have been elected by the people.”§ Nay, he adduces the direct testimony of St. Gregory Nazianzen, in contradiction of Dr. Pusey’s construction of the letter; that “*by*” the incidents described in it, “by the vote of all the people,” Athanasius was “in a spiritual and apostolical way” elected.||

Sirmond says, in language, every word of which is weighed and measured with the exactest conformity to history: “It was the *ancient custom of the whole Church*, that Bishops should be *created by the suffrages of the clergy and people* over whom they were to be. *Innumerable instances, everywhere,*

* Of the Consecration of the Bishops in the Church of England: &c. Lib. IV. Chap. 4. p. 159. ed. Lond. 1613.

† “Qui plebis partes non alias ponunt antiquitus, nisi ut testimonium reddat de vita et moribus promovendi—*errare se cognoscant.*” De Repub. Eccl. III. iii. 42. Tom. I. p. 411. E. ed. London, 1617.

‡ Antiquities, &c., Book IV. ch. ii.

§ “—populum Alexandria, ut in aliis Ecclesiis, suas in eligendo Episcopo antiquitus partes habuisse.” “—et sane videntur ab antiquissimis temporibus a populo eligi Alexandrinæ Episcopi.” Viud. Ignat. P. I. c. xi. 339 A. 338 B. in Apost. Patr. Amsteloed.

|| Orat. 21. Ὅτις μὲν οὖν καὶ διὰ ταῦτα, ψήφῳ τοῦ λαοῦ πάντως—ἀποστολικῶς τι καὶ ἐκκλησιαστικῶς ἐπὶ τὸν Μάρτυρ ἐρέοντες ἀνάγειται. Pearson. ub. sup.

show that *the right of voting* in the appointment of Bishops remained *in the people*, in the Western Churches," down to the time of the Carolingian empire. "In the Gauls, it is plain that *the votes of the clergy and of the people in the election of Bishops were free*, as long as they were under the Roman empire."*

"The election of a Bishop," says Petau, "was in such wise left to the votes of the people, that Bishops were present, or rather presided, for the purpose of preserving order in the proceedings, and directing them. *Nothing can be more absurd than to say that this custom was abrogated by the Council of Nice, and election reserved to the Bishops.* On the contrary, it continued long after the Nicene Council to be the practice that *the Bishops were created by the people.*" After citing Celestine, and Leo, and the Fourth Council of Carthage and the Second of Arles, he breaks off—"sed in re trita et vulgata, nihil opus est testimoniis."†

It is in contradiction to the judgment of such men that we are now asked to receive an account of the procedure of the early Church in Episcopal appointments, according to which they would be fitly and truly described in the severe but just language used by Hooker of appointments of another kind. When the assembled Bishops "have chosen whom they think good, the people's consent thereunto is asked, and if they give their approbation, the thing standeth warranted for sound and good. But if not, is the former choice overthrown? No, but the people is to yield to reason; and if they which have made the choice, do so like the people's reason, as to reverse their own deed at the hearing of it, then a new election is to be made; otherwise the former to stand, notwithstanding the people's negative and dislike. What is this else, but to deal with the people as those nurses do with infants, whose mouths they besmear with the backside of the spoon, as though they had fed them, when they themselves devour the food?"‡

Dr. Pusey's misapplication of the 18th canon of the Coun-

* "Vetus olim totius Ecclesie mos, episcopos cleri et plebis, cui prefaturi erant, suffragiis creari." *Concil. Gallican.* II, 633. "In Occidentalibus Ecclesiis—jus suffragii populo in renuntiandis Episcopis—perseverasse—innumera passim exempla declarant." *Ibid.* 654. "Apparet libera in Galliis, quamdiu imperio Romano paruerunt, cleri plebique in Episcoporum electione suffragia fuisse." *Ibid.* On that same "VETUS MOS" (τὸ παλῶν ἔθος, ὁποῦν δὲναμιν ἔχον, διὰ τὸ ἔσθ' ἀγίων ἀνδρῶν τοῖς θυσιαῖς ἡμῶν παροδοῦναι, as St. Basil says of it, Ep. 197, al. 160) much might be said, bearing on the root of all this question. See Gothofredi Comm. in Lib. XVI. Cod. Theodos. Tit. ii. De Episcopis. L. Omni. 45.

† In Synesium Nota Dion. Petavii. p. 56. ed. 1633.

‡ Eccl. Pol. VII, xiv, 10, III. 229. Keble.

cil of Antioch, (p. 44,) to the case of a refusal to elect in order to consecration, instead of that to which it really applies, a falling off from an election made after consecration had, brings his view of the relation between the Bishops and the people strictly within the range of Hooker's withering sarcasm. "The People might reject the Bishop provided for them," yet the case must be "referred back to the full Synod," that is, to the Bishops who had "provided" him!

The canon in question did not contemplate the invasion of popular right under a delusory recognition which Dr. Pusey finds in it: but it does exemplify very well the peculiar difficulties that attend the study of this question, growing partly out of the paucity and indirectness of the proofs in the short period of the liberty of the Church; partly out of the disturbing influence of the civil power, increased and sadly complicated by the three hundred years of struggle with schisms and heresies which succeeded the first three hundred years of strife with heathen rule. In every direction there were continually recurring temptations to strain, distort, or alter law to meet circumstances; and all that we know of the action of the Church, comes down to us through a medium of more or less prejudice and party spirit. Our information, too, is naturally derived mostly from the history of the greater Sees, in the management of which all the worst elements of strife and corruption were incessantly interfering with the operation of established principle and law.

Thus it was that at Antioch the persecutors of Athanasius, set on by the Arianizing court of Constantius, legislated to keep him out of the See whence he had been unjustly expelled, against the will of his people, who had rejected the intruder Gregory, forced upon them by the Arian Bishops and the court. The 4th, 11th, 12th, 18th, and 19th canons obviously bear on the circumstances, real or alleged, of Athanasius and the intruder into his See; and several of the others are as obviously framed with reference to the condition of the Alexandrian patriarchate at the time. Of such legislation the very utmost to be expected is that it shall not be found flagrantly to violate law or usage offering inconvenient hindrance to the schemes of unrighteous usurpation. A reference to a Provincial Synod was doubtless thought ample concession to the aggrieved rights of the Laity; for contempt of which, St. Athanasius charges Constantius with showing himself as Antichrist; inasmuch as he "has undertaken to change the law, setting aside the ordinance of the Lord by the Apostles, changing the custom of the Church, and in-

venting a new sort of ordinations," of which, the alleged anomalies are: 1, bringing Bishops from strange and distant places; 2, "to people who will them not;" and 3, with threats and letters to the civil governors, "instead of proper recommendations to the people."* Here the people are the aggrieved claimants, whose rights by custom of the Church, old law, and the constitution of the Lord by the Apostles, have been infringed upon. The Bishops in question were ordained and sent, under the Emperor's command, by other Bishops. Athanasius does not insist on the rights of the provincial Bishops, so rudely set aside, as the main ground of grievance, (or even sole ground, as it would have been, by Dr. Pusey's hypothesis,) nor as any. The people; and their will, are his ground of claim. They had chosen him. They had rejected Gregory. For violating their rights, he regarded Constantius as little better than an Antichrist. And yet it was to aid in carrying through that violation, that the Eusebians at the Synod of the Dedication passed the Antiochene canon about rejected Bishops!

A very different course had been pursued, nine years before, by the father of Constantius. He, too, at the instigation of the same Eusebians, had sanctioned the displacement from the very See where this Council was now held, of the orthodox Bishop. Eusebius describes the resulting difficulties† (no doubt really arising from sympathy with their unrighteously condemned Bishop) as growing up among the Laity (*εις δὲ οὖν μὲν τμήματα διαίρεσθαι τῶν τῆς ἐκκλησίας λαῶν*) and as spreading from them to the commonalty of the city, and even to the governors and military: and says that the strenuous exertions of Constantine and his emissaries *τὰς τοῦ πλήθους ἀνέστειλεν ὁρμὰς* composed the storms of the multitude. These, says the panegyrist, 'he taught to do what befitted godliness,' (*ἐδιδάσκεν πρᾶττειν θεοσεβεῖα προπόντως*.)—they had the management of affairs, then, to some extent. Thus they were brought to acquiesce in the deprivation of their Bishop, and the appointment of a substitute. But unfortunately for the latter purpose, the choice of the people fell on Eusebius, already Bishop of Cæsarea, who had distinguished himself by his successful eloquence in furtherance of the Emperor's purposes.

Eusebius, declining to give the imperial letters preceding

* Ep. ad Solitar. 974, fin. ἐβρόντησεν ἀλλοιῶσαι νόμον, παραλῶν μὲν τοῖς κρείσσιν διὰ τῶν Ἀρεοτάδων διάταξιν, τὰ δὲ τῆς ἐκκλησίας ἀλλόττων ἐστὶ καὶ κατὰ τὴν ἐκκλησίαν ἐκινῶν τῶν κατὰ κράτος.—*ἡρῶς τοῖς μὴ θέλοντας λαοῖς—ἀντὶ γνώσεως τῆς ἐκκλ. τοῖς λαοῖς.* (Hist. Arian. Ch. vii. n. 15, p. 286, Ox. Tr.)

† Vit. Constantin. III, lix, (f. 145 ed Steph.)

his own election, on the ground that being full of matter of accusation, their publication might stir up anew old griefs, transcribes those only which followed the settlement of the troubles; "by which the Emperor exhorted the Antiochenes by no means *to will* the translation of the ruler of others, but in pursuance of the law of the Church, *to choose* for their Pastor whomsoever the Saviour of all should indicate, writing separately both to *the people* and to the Bishops."* The choice, it must be remembered, was to be of a metropolitan, in which the *elective* part of the Bishops was more direct than in filling an ordinary See. But there, *the people* are first thought of and addressed as having, in the exercise of their *will* and *choice*, the right and duty of carrying out the *law* of the Church, and ministering in the providential government of the Saviour.

In his letter separately addressed to the people, (τῷ λαῷ Ἀντιοχείων,) Constantine, setting before them the reasons for not persisting in their choice of Eusebius, (of which they had sent him records (ἀπομνημονεύματα) of their proceedings, in which were recorded αἱ ἐνθυμηταὶ καὶ μαρτυρίαι αἱ εἰς Ἐυσέβιον, the cries of the people, their plaudits and epithets of praise when they declared their choice of him,) speaks of it as depending on the *mind of the multitude*—ἅν θ' ὄντως ἅν θ' ἐτέρας τὰ πλείθνη φρονῇ. He urges them to 'See—θεύσασθε—that according to the good rule of their customary usage—ὁ τῆς ὑμετέρας συνήθειας ἐστὶν ἀγαθὴ γνῶμη—they bestow the necessary pains *in seeking out* (σπουδῇ—εἰς ἐκζητήσιν) such a man as they want, excluding all factious and disorderly clamor.† For such procedure is always unjust, and out of the collisions of different (interests in behalf of the several objects of preference) sparks and flames arise.' He ends with cautioning them so to manage the course of things, as not a second time to fail for want of counsel, and make their trouble profitless. All this, *to the people*. In the Emperor's letter to Eusebius, it is noticeable, that in recounting what he has done, he mentions "the Epistle *to the people*" first, and after that, its companion-letter "to the other fellow-priests" of Eusebius, (the Bishops;) 'who,' he says, 'had themselves written to him on the matter.' So in his letter to the assembled Bishops themselves,—after acknowledging the account which he had received from them and from his secular officers, and

* Δ' ὡς παρὴν ἀλλοτρίου μὴν ὄγκοντος—μυδαμὺς ἐβίβλιν μεταποιεῖσθαι, θυσμῶ δ' ἐκκλησίας τοῦτον ἀρεσθῆναι τοῖμνα, δὲ αὐτοῖς ἀναδοῦξιν ὁ κοινὸς ὡν ἐλκεν Σωτήρ. Γράφει δὲ αὐτῷ τὴν λαφ, καὶ τοῖς ἐπισκόποις διαφέρων.

† No doubt the Emperor means by this to suggest that there are to be no *Eustathian votes*—no shouts of commendation for the deposed Bishops!

referring them to an appended copy of his letter "To the People of the Antiochians," in which he had counseled them what would be pleasing to God and for the good of the Church—he refers to the statement in their letter to him, "that according to the mind and will of the people, and of your resolution, Eusebius has been promoted to the Episcopate of the Antiochians."* This clause no doubt, as Valesius notes, was a mere extract from the Bishops' letter to the Emperor. They, therefore, had spoken in those terms, and in that order, of the transaction.

Constantine goes on to recommend two Presbyters, as reported to him to be worthy of the Episcopate, whom he thinks it well to indicate to the Bishops (*δηλώσαι τῇ συνέσει ὑμῶν*) as fit to be by them, with any others whom they might think worthy of the Episcopate *προχειρισάμενους*—*nominated* or *proposed* for election;† in doing which, the Bishops would take action in the matter conformably with the tradition of the Apostles. 'Thus should the rule of the Church and the Apostolic tradition be maintained in the regulation of the election (*τὴν χειροτονίαν*, 'electionem' Vales.) in consonance with ecclesiastic observance.‡ The *election of their Bishop* by the people of Antioch, would thus be upon nomination of their metropolitan (or Exarch, afterwards Patriarch) by the Bishops of the Eparchy; the latter, in this case, making the nomination upon suggestion by the Emperor, himself not even a Layman, but a mere catechumen.

Under the wise father, the Bishops of the Antiochene Synod, in 332, recognized and directed the power, which, to gratify the ill-advised son, in 341, the Bishops of the later Synod legislated to thwart and nullify. The Council of 341, while it could not deny, sought to destroy the right of the Laity of a Diocese to reject an intruded Bishop, by affirming a final appellate control over it by a Provincial Synod. Constantine and the Synod of 332, while they fully owned, cautiously wrought upon and directed, the Lay responsibility for the *person*, selected to receive *office* from those in whose sole

* —ὅστις κατὰ τὴν τοῦ Ἀποσ. καὶ τῆς ὑμετέρας προαίρεσις συνίστητε καὶ βούλησιν Ἐπισβίον—ἐν τῇ [ἐκκλησίᾳ] Ἀντιοχείᾳ προκαθίσταται—where are to be observed, 1, the precedence again given to the people and their action; 2, the provision or conciliary action of the Bishops; 3, the use of *σύνισις* and *βούλησις* *jointly* of the action of both people and Bishops.

† Valesius, in a valuable and instructive note, shows that such is the meaning; and that in settlement of a Bishop, *προχειρισμός* was followed by scrutiny (into life and character;) that, by election; and that, lastly, by ordination or consecration.

‡ Vit. Const. III. lxii. f. 146, ed. Steph.

keeping the power to confer it was by all alike held to be reposed.

It is too important to this question not to be distinctly brought out, that the absolute right of Bishops to grant or withhold ordination, is utterly untouched by the interest of the Laity in providing objects for the exercise of that right. It is as true here, in the United States, where the Laity have a voice in all admissions to Holy Orders, as it ever was anywhere, that in all cases "the decision lies with the Bishops,"—the person ordained "is *given* to the people" by those who have a perfect and unquestionable right to withhold the gift. Hooker's description of the first constitution of the diaconate applies perfectly, *mutatis mutandis*, to our American admissions to Orders of any degree, and to the primitive proceedings in the settlement of a Bishop.

"When Deacons having not been before in the Church of Christ, the Apostles saw it needful to have such ordained, they first assemble the multitude, and show them how needful it is that Deacons [a Bishop] be made: secondly, they name unto them what number they judge convenient, what quality the men must be of, and to the people they commit the care of finding such out: thirdly, the people *hereunto assenting, make their choice* of Stephen and the rest; [a candidate for the Episcopate:] *those chosen men they bring and present* before the Apostles: howbeit, all this does not endue them with any ecclesiastical power. But when so much was done, the Apostles, finding no cause to take exception, did with prayer and imposition of hands make them Deacons, [a Bishop.] *This was it which gave them their very being*; all other things besides were only preparations unto this."^{*}

Our clear, consistent reading of history depends entirely on the attention with which we keep distinct the several agencies thus concerned in bringing together the *person* and the *office*, under diverse responsibilities and with separate instrumentalities in creating the resulting *officer*.

On the occurrence of a vacancy in the Episcopate, or of a need for the erection of a new See, an Office is presented to be filled. It is in the trust and keeping of certain officers and stewards. They have to answer for its right bestowal, on their peril. They give it, or withhold it, as they find it consistent with their trust to do. It is to be asked of them. It can never be obtained, but by their grant. Of the duty and fitness of making that grant, they must be the judges. Every time they make it, they act judicially and authoritatively. Until they decide to give, and act on their decision, all preliminaries are worthless and ineffectual.

But these trustees hold under certain obligations. He who created the trust *may* have created it as a limited trust. He

^{*} Ecc. Pol. VII. xiv. S.—III. 223, s. ed. Keble.

may have laid down laws for its exercise. He *may* have prescribed conditions indispensably pre-requisite to its being called into operation.

They themselves, moreover, inasmuch as they exercise a joint trust in common, *must* have certain regulations, of force among themselves for their own government in the administration of their trust.

Such regulations must prescribe the conditions under which office is to be imparted or created, and to some extent establish the principles on which judgment is to be given in bestowing it.

A See is vacant, or a new See to be created.

Who is to fill it? The nearest Bishops? If so, how many? which? *Any*, conjoined by hazard? or only those in certain relations? if so, in what relations? how determined? under what sanctions? with what limits and restraints?

All these questions, obviously, concern only the mode of discharging trust in conveying *office*. Their settlement on one or another principle, in one or another way, in no wise affects the fulness and absoluteness of the trust.

But office requires *person* as its subject.

Who is charged with the provision of that subject?

It is certainly conceivable that such provision should be an independent and coördinate trust. It would be consistent with many analogies in nature and Providence that it should be so. All life is dependent on the coincidence of two coördinates for its origination and continuance. The concretion of abstract Office into the officer may be rendered contingent on the coöperation of two several trusts, either absolutely incapable of separate discharge, or mutually dependent for right and efficient action, or subordinated the one to the other, so that the interdependence, though general, shall not be universal, admitting of differences of relation, and degrees of limitation. This last condition, again, would be in accordance with analogies all but universal.

The question in discussion is, whether such independent and coördinate trusts, absolute or modified, do exist in the case of the Episcopate? Whether, in the fulfillment of the organic functions of the Church, provision has been made for the supply of persons to fill its highest trust by an instrumentality different from that to which is committed the continuance of the trust itself? Whether, while the *Office* is committed, for perpetuation, to those who hold it as a joint trust in common, to be given or withheld under rules governing themselves and themselves only, the provision of *persons* to bear the Office

has been left, more or less absolute or restricted, to what may be generalized under "the *personality*" of the Church—the whole body of those *not* bearing Office?

The analogical probability is, *a priori*, strongly in favor of the affirmative. All nature, all life, all society, seems to work by such combination of binary forces. The unlikelihood is on the side of a trust *not* coparcenary. An organ in a body not dependent on other organs for nutriment, increment, development, and direction of forces, would be monstrous. An Office in a society, held and filled at the independent and uncontrolled will and conscience of its occupants would be little, if at all less so. As an organ of the Body of Christ, as an Office in the Society of which He is Head and Captain, a self-electing Episcopate, kept up by its own accretion to itself of material of its own choice and provision, would be equally anomalous and unexampled.

But there are grave reasons, in this case, in the nature of the trust itself, why it must be participated in by the people, τὸ πλῆθος, as well as the segregated ministry, ὁ κληρὸς.

The Catholic maxim "*Ecclesia est in Episcopo*" is true, first, because the commission "to send as sent" involves the continuation and extension of the work of Christ in His Church in all its means and appliances, and in the work, of all its fruits; but secondly, also, because the visible type and outward mean of the unity of the Church is in the Bishop. In the Diocese with its Bishop, is the visible earthly plenitude of the Church, a *church* in its ἰδίον σωμῶστίον according to Ignatius, the "omnium corpus" of Polycarp, in the old Latin version of his Epistle. To the constitution of that completeness two factors must contribute: 1, a representation of its One Head in heaven; 2, a representation of the members *as one*; the coincidence of these in one being the visible symbol and pledge, the living sacrament, as it were, of the oneness of the whole in its entirety. They coincide in the Bishop, when he is *really* the representative of the people, τὸ πλῆθος, (the clergy and laity, in this respect, making up but one body,) and at the same time actually by commission from Christ, *His* representative. Of this two-fold delegacy of the Bishop his brethren in the ministry of lower degrees are inferior sharers, each in his place and station, holding for portions of the flock and for seasons of more or less duration, a share of the commission of the Bishop, and receiving for that share, an appointment from the people, more or less directly. Through the Bishop the commission from heaven radiates, and in him the delegacy of the community culminates. Only in the *joint* representation which he bears

does he become the actual symbol and quoin, as it were, of the oneness of the body, in which it is a *church*.

Again: it has appeared in many of the passages I have had occasion to adduce, how perfectly the early writers acquiesced in the view of the Episcopate, as the Priesthood of the Church in its highest and a quite peculiar type. 'Ο ἱερεὺς and *Sacerdos*, "the priest" by way of eminence, are quite as often as any other term the designation of the chief minister of the diocese.

It is as the "minister" or servant, *both* of Christ and of *His people*, that the Bishop is thus preëminently the Priest. Ministering for the ONE TRUE PRIEST in heaven, he represents in the functions of his office the one only Oblation and Intercession, and is the instrument of the Great High Priest for carrying on His work on earth. So does every minister. So do all the ministers in the diocese. But their ministry concentrates in their chief, through whom it is imparted, and by whom it is directed. For and to the Church he represents the Priesthood of Christ, carried on by its human instruments. But the Priesthood of Christ is imparted to all His Church, making it a "kingdom of priests." That Priesthood in the membership is continually exercised in all acts of worship. The offering to God through Christ is made by the whole Body, every part participating in the sacrificial act. Of that universal Priesthood the chief representative of the people is the focus—the point, as it were, of the ascending flame. In the coincidence of that representative Priesthood of the people with the ministerial Priesthood of Christ, the Priesthood of the Church on earth receives its unity and perfectness. It has them, when the man elected by the people to serve them in the Priesthood receives his commission from Christ to minister in His behalf in the things pertaining to God.

Further: the organic life of the Church on earth as a Divinely constituted human Body consists, in one aspect, in the exercise of powers and the submission to that exercise, meeting and coalescing; in another, in the discharge of functions and the acknowledgment of those functions in the persons of the bearers, mutually coinciding. Power to act in the Church must be *from* Christ, exercised by His representative. Submission to its exercise must be *by* the people of Christ, and implies choice of the object *to* which it is made. "Willing in the day of the power of their Lord," they show their willingness by receiving in His Name whom He sends to them; but as a people they do this by delegation of one from among themselves to be their symbol and bear that Name. As such, the Bishop is the perpetual type of Christ's

people bearing the Master's yoke, while on the part of the Lord, whose commission they have chosen him to receive, he represents the power of which, in the office of his ministry, he is the instrument.

The functions of that office are received by the Bishop *from* the whole Church, and *for* the whole. His ordainers represent the Episcopate in common, (*in solidum*;) and his orders are good throughout the Catholic Church. But in him the functions are committed to a person, whom the whole Church knows only through his office. The recognition of the office in the person, and consequent acknowledgment of the functions, is made for the diocese by those interested in their discharge, the people. In minor degree, this takes place in each order of the ministry; but it culminates in the Bishop, and is, therefore, preëminently requisite in his appointment. As in marriage, not only does the man take the woman to his wedded wife, but the woman also, for her part, takes him for her wedded husband; so the restraint of the Episcopate, held in common of all its members, begins when the diocese fixes on the man in whom it shall be vested, and is consummated in the impartation of the office so restrained to the person thereby capacitated for its reception.

Such, my dear ———, are some of the reasons lying behind the facts of history, why the right of the Laity in the election of a Bishop seems to me a matter of too much moment to be left without vindication when assailed. The higher the authority arrayed against it, the more venerable, on every account, the name by which it is in danger of being borne down, the more bounden the duty of marshaling in its defense whatever slender stores any one, however humble, may happen to be able to command.

Faithfully and affectionately, yours,

EDITORIAL NOTE.—We commence, on the following page, the promised reprint of the PRAYER BOOK, known as "THE PROPOSED BOOK" of 1785. We give in this No. the Title Page, Contents, Preface, Proper Lessons appointed for Sundays and Holy Days, and The Morning and Evening Prayer. In another Number will appear the Catechism, the Baptismal Service, the Articles, &c. A careful comparison of these with the PRAYER BOOK as ratified and established in the Convention of 1789, will show the variations between these two Books, some of which are significant. Other variations between the two Books, and in parts which will not be reprinted, may be found in the arrangement of the Psalter, a considerable number of Psalms being altogether omitted; in the Epistles and Gospels; and in the Order for the administration of the LORD'S SUPPER. A more full account of the "alterations," &c. in the present "PRAYER BOOK," as drawn up by Bishop White, will also be given in a subsequent No.; together with the opinion entertained of this "Proposed Book" by Bishop Seabury. The formal action of the Church upon "THE PROPOSED BOOK," and the "PRAYER BOOK," will also appear in the Early Journals of the General Conventions, which will be reprinted in full in subsequent Numbers of the CHURCH REVIEW. There are some other important documents on the Early History of the Church in this country, which will appear in due time, and which are now entirely out of print, and some of them utterly unknown save to a few. Having been requested to reprint extra copies of these historical papers, we beg to say, that we have no such intention. The labor of procuring, compiling, and arranging this important material, was of course expressly designed to give permanent value to THE AMERICAN QUARTERLY CHURCH REVIEW.

AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY.

THE PROPOSED BOOK.

T H E

B O O K

O F

COMMON PRAYER,

And ADMINISTRATION of the

SACRAMENTS,

And other

rites and CEREMONIES,

As revised and proposed to the Use

O F

The Protestant Episcopal CHURCH,

At a Convention of the said CHURCH in the States of

NEW-YORK,
NEW-JERSEY,
PENNSYLVANIA,
DELAWARE,

MARYLAND,
VIRGINIA,
AND
SOUTH-CAROLINA,

Held in Philadelphia, from September 27th to October 7th, 1785.

PHILADELPHIA,

Printed by HALL and SELLERS:

And sold for the Benefit of sundry Corporations and Societies, instituted for the Support of the Widows and Children of deceased Clergymen. MDCCLXXXVI.

Extract from the Minutes of the Convention.

R E S O L V E D, That a Committee be appointed to publish the Book of Common Prayer with the alterations, as well those now ratified in order to render the Liturgy consistent with the American revolution and the constitutions of the respective states, as the alterations and new offices recommended to this Church; and that the Book be accompanied with a proper Preface or Address, setting forth the reason and expediency of the alterations; and that the committee have the liberty to make verbal and grammatical corrections; but in such manner, as that nothing in form or substance be altered.

Agreeably to the above Resolve, the BOOK OF COMMON PRAYER, as proposed by the Convention, is now published by their Committee.

I JONATHAN BAYARD SMITH, Prothonotary of the Court of Common Pleas of the county of *Philadelphia*, do certify that Messieurs *Hall* and *Sellers*, printers and assignees, have entered, according to act of Assembly, a book, entitled "The Book of Common Prayer, and Administration of the Sacraments, and other Rites and Ceremonies, as revised and proposed for the Use of the Protestant Episcopal Church; at a Convention of the said Church in the States of New-York, New-Jersey, Pennsylvania, Delaware, Maryland, Virginia and South-Carolina, held in *Philadelphia*, from September 27th to October 7th, 1785."

J. B. SMITH.

April 1, 1786.

T H E

CONTENTS of this B O O K.

- 1 THE Preface.
- 2 Tables of the Moveable and Immoveable Feasts, and of the Days of Fasting and Abstinence through the whole Year.
- 3 Tables of Lessons of Holy Scripture, to be read at Morning and Evening Prayer, throughout the Year.
- 4 Tables for finding the Holy-Days.
- 5 The Order for Daily Morning Prayer.
- 6 The Order for Daily Evening Prayer.
- 7 Prayers and Thanksgivings upon several Occasions, to be used before the two final Prayers of Morning and Evening Service.

- 8 Collects that may be said after the Collects of Morning or Evening Prayer, or Communion, at the Discretion of the Minister.
- 9 The Order for the Administration of the Lord's Supper, or Holy Communion.
- 10 The Collects, Epistles, and Gospels, to be used throughout the Year.
- 11 The Ministration of Public Baptism of Infants, to be used in the Church.
- 12 The Ministration of Private Baptism of Children in Houses.
- 13 The Ministration of Baptism to such as are of riper Years, and able to answer for themselves.
- 14 A Catechism; that is to say, an Instruction to be learned by every Person before he be brought to be confirmed by the Bishop.
- 15 The Order of Confirmation, or laying on of Hands upon those who are baptized, and come to Years of Discretion.
- 16 The Form of Solemnization of Matrimony.
- 17 The Order for the Visitation of the Sick.
- 18 The Communion of the Sick.
- 19 A Form of Prayer for the Visitation of Prisoners.
- 20 The Order for the Burial of the Dead.
- 21 Forms of Prayer to be used at Sea.
- 22 A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the inestimable Blessings of Religious and Civil Liberty; to be used yearly on the Fourth Day of July, unless it happen to be on Sunday, and then on the Day following.
- 23 A Form of Prayer and Thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the Fruits of the Earth and all the other Blessings of his merciful Providence; to be used yearly on the first Thursday in November.
- 24 Articles of Religion.
- 25 The Psalter; selected from the Psalms of David.
- 26 Psalms fitted to the Tunes used in Churches, selected from the Psalms of David; Portions of which are to be sung at suitable Times in Divine Service, according to the Discretion of the Minister.
- 27 Hymns suited to the Feasts and Fasts of the Church, and other Occasions of Public Worship; to be used at the Discretion of the Minister.

The P R E F A C E.

IT is a most invaluable part of that blessed "*liberty wherewith CHRIST hath made us free*"—that, in his worship, different *forms and usages* may without offence be allowed, provided the *substance of the faith* be kept entire; and that, in every church, what cannot be clearly determined to belong to *doctrine* must be referred to *discipline*; and therefore, by common consent and authority may be altered, abridged, enlarged, amended, or otherwise disposed of, as may seem most convenient for the edification of the people, "according to the various exigencies of times and occasions."

THE CHURCH of ENGLAND, to which the Protestant Episcopal Church in these States is indebted, under GOD, for her first foundation and a long continuance of nursing care and protection, hath in the preface of her book of common prayer laid it down as a rule, that—"The particular forms of divine worship, and the rites and ceremonies appointed to be used therein, being things in their own nature indifferent and alterable, and so acknowledged, it is but reasonable that, upon weighty and important considerations, according to the various exigencies of times and occasions, such changes and alterations should be made therein, as to those who are in place of authority should, from time to time, seem either necessary or expedient."

This is not only the doctrine of the Church of England, and other Protestant Churches, but likewise of the *Church of Rome*; which hath declared, by the * Council of Trent—"That the church always had a power of making such constitutions and alterations in the dispensation of the *Sacraments*, provided their substance be preserved entire, as, with regard to the variety of circumstances and places, she should judge to be most expedient for the salvation of the receivers, or the veneration of the sacraments themselves.

The Church of England has, not only in her *preface*, but likewise in her *articles*† and *homilies*‡ declared the necessity and expediency of

* *Declarat (sancta synodus) hanc potestatem perpetuo in ecclesia fuisse; ut in sacramentorum dispensatione, salva illorum substantia, ea statueret vel mutaret quæ suscipientium saluti, seu ipsorum sacramentorum venerationi, pro rerum, temporum et locorum varietate, magis expedire judicaverit.* Sess. 21, cap. 2. Concil. Trident. And agreeably to this, their Breviary and Missal have been frequently reviewed; the Breviary heretofore three times in the short space of sixteen years only.

† "It is not necessary that traditions and ceremonies be in all places one, or utterly alike, for at all times they have been divers, and may be changed according to the diversity of countries, times and manners; so that nothing be ordained against God's word; [And therefore] every particular or national church hath authority to ordain, change and abolish ceremonies or rites of the church, ordained only by man's authority; so that all things be done to edifying." Art. 34.

‡ "God's church ought not, neither can it be so tied to any orders now made, or hereafter to be made and devised, by the authority of man; but that it may, for just causes, alter, change or mitigate—yea recede wholly from, and also break them"—&c. And again—"The church is not bound to observe any order, law or decree made by man to prescribe a form of RELIGION; but hath full power and authority from God, to change and alter the same, when need shall require. Homily on Fasting. Part 1.

occasional alterations and amendments in her forms of public worship ; and we find accordingly, that seeking to " keep the happy mean between too much *stiffness* in *refusing* and too much *easiness* in *admitting* variations in things once advisedly established, she hath, in the reign of several * princes, since the first compiling of her *liturgy* in the time of Edward the Sixth, upon just and weighty considerations her thereunto moving, yielded to make such alterations in some particulars, as in their respective times were thought convenient : Yet so as the main body and essential parts of the same (as well in the chiefest materials, as in the frame and order thereof) have still been continued firm and unshaken."—

" Her general aim in these different *reviews* and *alterations* hath been (as she further declares in her said preface) to do that which, according to her best understanding, might most tend to the preservation of *peace* and *unity* in the church ; the procuring of reverence, and the exciting of piety and devotion in the worship of God ; and (finally) the cutting off occasion, from them that seek occasion, of cavil or quarrel against her *liturgy*." And the necessity and expediency of the several variations made from time to time (whether by alteration, addition, or otherwise) she states chiefly under the following heads : viz.

1st. *For the better direction of them that are to officiate in any part of divine service ; which is chiefly done in the CALENDARS and RUBRICS.*

2d. *For the more proper expressing of some words or phrases of ancient usage in terms more suitable to the language of the present times ; and the clearer explanation of some other words and phrases that were of a doubtful signification, or otherwise liable to misconstruction ; or*

3d. *For a more perfect RENDERING (or translation) of such portions of holy scripture as are inserted into the liturgy (and made a part of the daily service ;) with the addition of some OFFICES, PRAYERS AND THANKSGIVINGS, fitted to special occasions.*

If, therefore, from the reasons above set forth (namely the change of times and circumstances, and the fluctuation of our language itself) so many different reviews, alterations and amendments were found necessary in the first *hundred and twelve* years after the *reformation* ; it could not be expected, but (the same causes and reasons still operating) some subsequent *reviews*, alterations and amendments would not only be found necessary, but be earnestly desired by many true members of the church, in the course of at least *one hundred and twenty* years more. And we accordingly find that in less than *thirty* years after the last review in 1661 (viz. on the 13th of September 1689) a commission for a further review of the liturgy and canons, &c. was issued out to a number of bishops and other divines ; than whom (it hath been truly acknowledged) the Church of England was never, at any one time, blessed with either wiser or better, since it was a church."

* *The Liturgy, in sundry particulars, hath been reviewed—altered and amended about eight different times, from its first publication, according to act of parliament in 1594 ; and its last review was in 1661, as it now stands, according to the Act of Uniformity.*

The chief matters proposed for a *review* at that time, and which have been since repeatedly *proposed* and stated under the decent and modest form of *queries*, are included under the following heads.

1st. Whether the *public service* on Sunday mornings be not of too *great length*, and tends rather to diminish than encrease devotion, especially among the lukewarm and negligent?

2d. Whether it might not be conveniently *contracted*, by omitting all unnecessary *repetitions* of the same prayers or subject matter; and whether a better adjustment of the necessary parts of the three different services, usually read every Sunday morning in the church, would not render the whole frame of the service more uniform, animated and compleat?

3d. Whether the old and new translations of the psalms ought not to be compared, in order to render both more agreeable to each other and to their divine original; so as to have but one translation, and that as compleat as possible?

4th. Whether *all the PSALMS* of David are applicable to the state and condition of *christian societies*, and ought to be read *promiscuously* as they now are; and whether some other method of reading them might not be appointed; including a *choice* of psalms and hymns, as well for ordinary use, as for the *festivals* and *fasts*, and other special occasions of public worship?

5th. Whether the subject matter of our *psalmody* or *singing* psalms should not be extended beyond those of David, which include but a few heads of *christian worship*, and whether much excellent matter might not be taken from the New Testament, as well as some parts of the Old Testament, especially the prophets; so as to introduce a greater variety of *anthems* and *hymns*, suited to the different festivals and other occasions of daily worship, private as well as public?

6th. Whether, in particular, a psalm or anthem should not be adapted to and sung at the celebration of the *Eucharist*, as was the primitive practice, and that recommended in our first liturgy?

7th. Whether all the lessons which are appointed to be read in the ordinary course are well chosen; and whether many of them may not be subject to one or more of the following objections, viz.—1. Either inexpedient to be read in mixt assemblies; or 2. Containing genealogies and passages either obscure, or of little benefit to be read in our congregations; or 3. Improperly divided; sometimes abrupt and unconnected in their beginning, as having respect to something that had gone before; and sometimes either too *short* or too *long*, and *apocryphal lessons* included among the number?

8th. Whether our epistles and gospels are all of them well selected; and whether after so many other portions of scripture they are necessary, especially unless the first design of inserting them, viz. as introductory to the communion, should be more regarded, and the communion be again made a daily part of the service of the church?

9th. Whether our *collects*, which in the main are excellent, are always suited to the epistles and gospels; and whether too many of them are

not of one sort, consisting of the same kind of substance? and whether there is any occasion of using the collect for the day twice in the same service?

10th. Whether the Athanasian creed may not, consistently with *piety, faith and charity*, be either wholly omitted, or left indifferent in itself?

11th. Whether our catechism may not require illustration in some points and enlargement in others; so that it may not only be rendered fit for children, but a help to those who become candidates for confirmation? And whether all the other offices, viz. the litany, the communion office, the offices of confirmation, matrimony, visitation of the sick, churching of women, and more especially those of baptism, burial and communion, do not call for a review and amendment in sundry particulars?

12th. Whether the calendars and rubricks do not demand a review and better adjustment; and whether any *words and phrases* in our common prayer, which are now less intelligible or common, or any way changed in their present acceptation from their original sense, should be retained? And whether others should not be substituted which are more modern, intelligible, and less liable to any misapprehension or construction?

13th. Whether the *articles of religion* may not deserve a *review*; and the subscription to them and the common prayer be contrived after some other manner, less exceptionable than at present?

These are the principal matters which have been long held up for public consideration, as still requiring a review in the book of common prayer; and altho' in the judgment of the church there be nothing in it "contrary to the word of God, or to sound doctrine, or which a godly man may not submit unto, or which is not fairly defensible if allowed such just and favourable construction as in common equity ought to be allowed to all human compositions; yet, upon the principles already laid down, (namely "the promoting of *peace and unity* in the church; the exciting of *piety and devotion*, and the removing, as far as possible, of all occasion of cavil or quarrel against the liturgy,") the pious and excellent divines who were commissioned in 1689, proceeded to the execution of the great work assigned them. They had before them all the exceptions which had, since the act of uniformity, been at any time made against any parts of the church service, which are chiefly set forth in the foregoing *queries*. They had likewise many propositions and advices, which had been offered at several times by some of the most eminent Bishops and Divines upon the different heads in question. Matters were well considered, freely and calmly debated; and all was digested into *one entire* * *correction* of every thing that seemed liable to

* *It will, without doubt, be agreeable to the members of our church, and those who esteem our liturgy and public service, to have at least a general account of the alterations and amendments which were desired and designed by such great and good men as Archbishop Tillotson and others, whose names are in the following account taken from Bishop Burnet, who was also in the commission, and from Dr. Nichols.*

any just objection. But this great and good work miscarried at that time; and the civil authority in Great Britain hath not since thought it proper to revive it by any new commission.

But when, in the course of divine providence, these American States became *independent* with respect to civil government, their *ecclesiastical independence* was necessarily included; and the different religious denominations of christians in these states were left at full and equal liberty to model and organize their respective churches and forms of worship and discipline, in such manner as they might judge most convenient for their future prosperity; consistently with the constitution and laws of their country.

The attention of this church was, in the first place, drawn to those alterations in the liturgy which became necessary in the *prayers* for our civil rulers, in consequence of the revolution; and the principal care herein was to make them conformable to what ought to be the proper end of all such prayers, namely, that "*rulers* may have grace, wisdom and understanding to execute justice and to maintain truth; and that the *people* may lead quiet and peaceable lives, in all godliness and honesty."

But while these alterations were in *review* before the late CONVENTION, they could not but, with gratitude to God, embrace the happy occasion which was offered to them (uninfluenced and unrestrained by any worldly authority whatsoever) to take a further review of the *public service*, and to propose to the *church* at large such other alterations

"*They began with reviewing the liturgy; and first they examined the calendar; in which, in the room of the apocryphal lessons, they ordered certain chapters of canonical scripture to be read, that were more for the peoples edification. The Athanasian creed being disliked by many persons on account of the damnatory clause, it was left at the minister's choice to use or change it for the Apostles creed. New collects were drawn up more agreeable to the epistles and gospels, for the whole course of the year, and with a force and beauty of expression capable of affecting and raising the mind in the strongest manner. The first draught was by Dr. PATRICK, who was esteemed to have a peculiar talent for composing prayers. Dr. BURNET added to them yet further force and spirit. Dr. STILLINGFLEET then examined every word in them with the exactest judgement. Dr. TILLOTSON gave them the last hand, by the free and masterly touches of his flowing eloquence. Dr. KIDDER, who was well versed in the oriental languages, made a new translation of the psalms, more conformable to the original. Dr. TENNISON having collected the words and expressions throughout the liturgy, which had been excepted against, proposed others in their room, which were more clear and plain. Other things were likewise proposed, as that the cross in baptism might be either used or omitted at the choice of the parents; and it is further added from other certain accounts, "that if any refused or scrupled to receive the Lord's Supper kneeling, it may be administered to them in their pews; that a rubrick be made, declaring the intention of the Lent fasts to consist only in extraordinary acts of devotion; not in distinction of meats; that the absolution may be read by a deacon; the word priest to be changed into minister; the Gloria Patri not to be repeated at the end of every psalm, but of all appointed for morning and evening—that the words in the Te Deum, Thine honourable, true and only Son, be changed into thine only begotten Son; that the Benedicite be changed into the 128th psalm, and other psalms appointed for the Benedicite and Nunc Dimittis; that if any desire to have godfathers and godmothers omitted, their children may be presented in their own names," &c.*

and amendments therein as might be deemed expedient; whether consisting of those which have been heretofore so long desired by many, or those which the late change of our circumstances might require, in our religious as well as civil capacity.

By comparing the following book, as now *offered* to the Church, with this *preface* and the *notes* annexed, it will appear that most of the amendments or alterations which had the sanction of the *great Divines* of 1689, have been adopted, with such others as are thought reasonable and expedient.

The service is arranged so as to stand as nearly as possible in the *order* in which it is to be read. A *selection* is made both of the *reading* and *singing* psalms, commonly so called. Wherever the Bible-translation of the former appeared preferable to the old translation, it hath been adopted; and in consequence of the new selection, a new division and considerable abridgement of the daily portions to be read became necessary; and as the "Glory be to the Father," &c. is once said or sung before the reading of the psalms in Morning and Evening prayer, it was conceived that, in order to avoid repetition, the solemnity would be increased by allowing the Minister to conclude the portion of the psalms which is at any time read, with that excellent doxology somewhat shortened, "Glory to God on high," &c. especially when it can be properly sung. With respect to the *psalmody* or *singing psalms*, for the greater ease of chusing such as are suited to particular subjects and occasions, they are disposed under the several *metres* and the *few* general heads to which they can be referred; and a *collection of hymns* are added, upon those *evangelical* subjects and other heads of christian worship, to which the psalms of *David* are less adapted, or do not generally extend.

It seems unnecessary to enumerate particularly all the different alterations and amendments which are proposed. They will readily appear, and it is hoped the reason of them also, upon a comparison of this with the former book. The *Calendar* and *Rubricks* have been altered where it appeared necessary, and the same reasons which occasioned a table of *first lessons* for Sundays and other Holy-days, seemed to require the making of a table of *second lessons* also, which is accordingly done. Those for the morning are intended to suit the several seasons, without any material repetition of the epistles and gospels for the same seasons; and those for the evening are selected in the order of the sacred books. Besides this, the table of first lessons has been reviewed; and some new chapters are introduced on the supposition of their being more edifying; and some transpositions of lessons have been made, the better to suit the seasons.

And whereas it hath been the practice of the church of England to set apart certain days of thanksgiving to Almighty God for signal mercies vouchsafed to that church and nation, it hath here also been considered as conducive to godliness, that there should be two *annual* solemn days of prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God set apart; viz. the fourth DAY OF JULY, commemorative of the blessings of *civil* and

religious liberty in the land wherein we live ; and the *first Thursday* of November for the *fruits of the earth* ; in order that we may be thereby stirred up to a more particular remembrance of the signal mercies of God towards us ; the neglect of which might otherwise be the occasion of licentiousness, civil miseries and punishments.

The case of such unhappy persons as may be imprisoned for debt or crimes claimed the attention of this church ; which hath accordingly adopted into her liturgy the form for the visitation of prisons in use in the church of Ireland.

In the creed commonly called the *Apostles creed*, one clause* is omitted, as being of uncertain meaning ; and the *articles of religion* have been reduced in number ; yet it is humbly conceived that the doctrines of the church of England are preserved entire, as being judged perfectly agreeable to the gospel.

It is far from the intention of this Church to depart from the Church of England, any farther than local circumstances require, or to deviate in any thing essential to the true meaning of the thirty-nine articles ; although the number of them be abridged by some variations in the mode of expression, and the omission of such articles as were more evidently adapted to the times when they were first framed and to the political constitution of England.

And now, this important work being brought to a conclusion, it is hoped the whole will be received and examined by every true member of our church and every sincere christian with a meek, candid and charitable frame of mind ; without prejudice or prepossessions ; seriously considering what *christianity* is, and what the truths of the gospel are ; and earnestly beseeching Almighty God, to accompany with his blessing every endeavour for promulgating them to mankind in the clearest, plainest, most affecting and majestic manner, for the sake of Jesus Christ, our blessed Lord and Saviour.

* *The clause meant is, "Christ's descent into hell," which, as Bishop Burnet, Bishop Pearson, and other writers inform us, is found in no creed, nor mentioned by any writer, until about the beginning of the 5th century ; and in the first creeds that have this clause or article, that of Christ's burial not being mentioned in them, it follows that they understood the descent into hell only of his burial or descent into the grave, as the word is otherwise translated in the Bible. The Nicene creed hath only the burial, and the Athanasian only the descent into hell.*

TABLES of the Moveable and Immoveable Feasts, and of the Days of Fasting and Abstinence, through the whole Year.

A TABLE of the Feasts that are appointed to be observed in this Church, throughout the year.

All Sundays in the year.
The Circumcision of our Lord Jesus Christ.
The Epiphany.
Monday and Tuesday in Easter Week.
The Ascension of our Lord Jesus Christ.
Monday and Tuesday in Whitsun Week.
The Nativity of our Lord Jesus Christ.

A TABLE of other Feasts which may be observed in this Church.

The Conversion of St. Paul.	St. Bartholomew the Apostle.
The Purification of the Blessed Virgin.	St. Matthew the Apostle.
St. Matthias the Apostle.	St. Michael and all Angels.
The Annunciation of the Blessed Virgin.	St. Luke the Evangelist.
St. Mark the Evangelist.	St. Simon and St. Jude, the Apostles.
St. Philip and St. James, the Apostles.	All Saints.
St. Barnabas.	St. Andrew the Apostle.
The Nativity of St. John Baptist.	St. Thomas the Apostle.
St. Peter the Apostle.	St. Stephen the Martyr.
St. James the Apostle.	St. John the Evangelist.
	The Holy Innocents.

Days of Fasting or Abstinence, appointed to be observed in this Church.

Ash-Wednesday. Good-Friday.

Other Days of Fasting or Abstinence which may be observed in this Church.

- 1st. The Forty Days of Lent.
- 2d. The Wednesday, Friday and Saturday after the first Sunday in Lent, the Feast of Pentecost, September 14, and December 13.
- 3d. The Monday, Tuesday and Wednesday before the Festival of the Ascension.
- 4th. All the Fridays in the year, except Christmas Day.

Certain solemn Days, for which particular Services are appointed.

- 1st. The fourth day of July, unless it happen on Sunday, and then on the day following; to be observed with prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the inestimable blessings of religious and civil liberty.
- 2d. The first Thursday in November; to be observed with prayer and thanksgiving to Almighty God, for the fruits of the earth and all the other blessings of his merciful providence.

¶ T A B L E S of LESSONS of Holy Scripture, to be read at Morning and Evening Prayer throughout the Year.

¶ Note, That on the Sundays and other Holy-Days, the Lessons which are according to the Calendar, shall be omitted.

A Table of Lessons for Sundays and other Holy-Days, appointed to be observed in this Church.

Holy-Days.	M O R N I N G.		E V E N I N G.	
	First Lessons.	Second Lessons.	First Lessons.	Second Less.
1 S. in Adv.	Isaiah 1	Luke 1 to v. 39	Isai. 2	Rom. 12
2	5	v. 39	24	13
3	25	3 to v. 19	26	14
4	30	Mat. 3 to v. 13	32	1 Cor. 1
Nativity.	9 to v. 8	Luke 2 to v. 15	7 v. 10 to 17	Tit. 3 v. 4 to 9
1 S. af. Chr.	35	v. 25	38	1 Cor. 2
Circumcision.	Gen. 17	Rom. 2	Deu. 10 v. 17	Coloss. 2
2 S. af. Chr.	Isaiah 41	2	Isai. 43	2
Epiphany.	60	Rom. 11	49	John 2 to v. 12
1 S. af. Epi.	44	Mat. 2 v. 13	46	1 Cor. 13
2	51	John 1 v. 29	53	15
3	55	Mat. 4 v. 12	56	2 Cor. 4
4	57	Lu. 4 v. 14 to 33	58	5
5	59	Mat. 5	64	Gal. 2
6	65	6	66	3
Sept. Sund.	Jeremiah 5	7	Jere. 22	Ephes. 1
Sexag. Sund.	30	Luke 7 v. 19	31	2
Quing. Sund.	35	Mark 6 v. 14	36	3
Ash-Wednes.	Isaiah 58	Lu. 5 v. 27 to 36	Jona. 3	2 Pet. 3 to v. 15
1 S. in Lent.	Ezekiel 2	Mat. 10	Eze. 13	Ephes. 4
2	14	Luke 10 to v. 23	18	5
3	20	Mark 9 to v. 14	24	6
4	Micah 6	Luke 19 v. 28	Hab. 2	Phil. 2
5	Daniel 2	21	Dan. 7	3
6	9	Mat. 26	Mal. 3 & 4	Heb. 5 to v. 11
Good-Friday.	Gen. 22 to v. 20	John 18	Isai. 53	1 Pet. 2
Easter Day.	Exo. 12 to v. 37	Rom. 6	Exo. 12 v. 37	Acts 2 v. 22
Monday.	Daniel 12	Mat. 28	Job 19	3
Tuesday.	Isai. 26 to v. 20	Luke 24 to v. 13	Isai. 52	1 Cor. 15
1 S. af. Eas.	Prov. 1	Acts 1	Prov. 2	Coloss. 1
2	3	3	8	2
3	11	4 to v. 34	12	3
4	13	5 v. 19	14	1 The. 4
5	15	6	17	5

TABLE of LESSONS, &c.

<i>Holy-Days.</i>	MORNING.		EVENING.	
	First Lessons.	Second Lessons.	First Lessons.	Second Less.
<i>Ascen. Day.</i>	2 Ki. 2 to v. 15	Luke 24 v. 44	2 Kin. 2 v. 15	Eph. 4 to v. 17
<i>S. af. Ascen.</i>	Prov. 17	John 17	Prov. 19	2 Th. 3 to v. 17
<i>Wth Sunday.</i>	Deu. 16 to v. 18	Acts 10 v. 34	Isaiah 11	Ac. 19 to v. 21
<i>Monday.</i>	Gen. 11 to v. 10	1 Cor. 12	Num. 11	1 Cor. 14
<i>Tuesday.</i>	1 Sam. 19 v. 18	1 The. 5	Deut. 30	to v. 26
		v. 12 to 24		1 John 4
<i>Trin. Sunday.</i>	Gen. 1	Mat. 3	Gen. 2	to v. 14
<i>1 S. af. Trin.</i>	3	Acts 9 to v. 32	6	5
2	9 to v. 20	10	15 to v. 19	1 Tim. 6
3	37	11	42	2 Tim. 2
4	43	14	45	3 & 4 to v. 9
				Titus 2 & 3 to v. 9
5	49	15	50	Heb. 10
6	Exod. 3	17	Exod. 5	11
7	9	20	10	12
8	12	24	14	13
9	Num. 16	26	Num. 20	James 1
10	23	28	24	2
11	Deut. 4 to v. 41	Mat. 18	Deut. 5	3
12	6	19	7	4
13	8	23	9	5
14	33	25	34	1 Pet. 1
15	Josh. 23	Luke 12	Josh. 24	2
16	1 Sam. 12	13	1 Sam. 16 to v. 14	3
17	1 Ch. 11 to v. 20	14	1 Ch. 17	4
18	2 Ch. 6	15 v. 11	2 Chr. 7	5
19	1 Ki. 12	20	1 Ki. 13	2 Pet. 1
20	18	John 3	19	2
21	2 Ki. 5	7	2 Ki. 19	3
22	22	8 to v. 46	23 to v. 26	1 John 2
23	23 v. 36	9	25	3
	d c. 24			
24	Dan. 3	10	Dan. 6	4
25	Ezra 1	11	Ezra 3	5
26	6	15	7 v. 6	Jude

A T A B L E of LESSONS for other Holy-Days which may be observed in this Church.

Note, These Lessons shall always be for the Days on which the said Holy-Days fall.

HOLY-DAYS.	MORNING.	EVENING.
<i>Saint Andrew.</i>	Prover. 20	Prover. 21
<i>St. Thomas the Apostle.</i>	23	24
<i>St. Stephen.</i>		
1 Lesson	28	Ecclesiast. 4
2 Lesson	Ac. 6 v. 8 & c. 7 to v. 30	Ac. 7 v. 30 to v. 55
<i>St. John.</i>		
1 Lesson	Ecclesiast. 5	Ecclesiast. 6
2 Lesson	Revelati. 1	Revela. 22
<i>Innocents Day.</i>	Jeremi. 31 to v. 18	Wisdom 1
<i>Conversion of St. Paul.</i>		
1 Lesson	Wisdom 5	Wisdom 6
2 Lesson	Acts 22 to v. 22	Acts 26
<i>Purification Vir. Mary.</i>	Wisdom 9	Wisdom 12
<i>St. Matthias.</i>	19	Ecclesiast. 1
<i>Anun. of V. Mary.</i>	Ecclesiast. 2	3
<i>Easter Even.</i>		
1 Lesson	Zechari. 9	Exodus 13
2 Lesson	Luke 23 to v. 50	Hebrews 4
<i>St. Mark.</i>	Ecclesiast. 4	Ecclesiast. 5
<i>St. Philip & St. James.</i>		
1 Lesson	7	9
2 Lesson	John 1 to v. 43	
<i>St. Barnabas.</i>		
1 Lesson	Ecclesi. 10	12
2 Lesson	Acts 14	Acts 15 to v. 36
<i>St. John Baptist.</i>		
1 Lesson	Malachi 3	Malachi 4
2 Lesson	Matthew 3	Matth. 14 to v. 13
<i>St. Peter.</i>		
1 Lesson	Ecclesi. 15	19
2 Lesson	Acts 3	Acts 4
<i>St. James.</i>	Ecclesi. 21	Ecclesi. 22
<i>St. Bartholomew.</i>	24	29
<i>St. Matthew.</i>	35	38
<i>St. Michael.</i>		
1 Lesson	Genesis 32	Daniel 10 v. 5
2 Lesson	Acts 12 to v. 20	Jude v. 6 to v. 16
<i>St. Luke.</i>	Ecclesi. 51	Job 1
<i>St. Simon & St. Jude.</i>	Job 24 25	42
<i>All Saints.</i>		
1 Lesson	Wisdom 3 to v. 10	Wisdom 5 to v. 17
2 Lesson	He. 11 v. 32 & c. 12 to v. 7	Revela. 19 to v. 17

The ORDER for Daily MORNING PRAYER.

¶ *The Minister shall begin the MORNING PRAYER by reading, with an audible voice, some of the following sentences of scripture.*

THE Lord is in his holy temple; let all the earth keep silence before him. *Hab. ii. 20.*

From the rising of the sun even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name and a pure offering; for my name shall be great among the heathen, saith the Lord of Hosts. *Mal. i. 11.*

When the wicked man turneth away from his wickedness that he hath committed, and doeth that which is lawful and right, he shall save his soul alive. *Ezek. xviii. 27.*

I acknowledge my transgressions, and my sin is ever before me. *Psal. li. 3.*

Hide thy face from my sins, and blot out all my iniquities. *Psal. li. 9.*

The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit: a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise. *Psal. li. 17.*

Rend your hearts, and not your garments, and turn unto the Lord your God: for he is gracious and merciful, slow to anger, and of great kindness, and repenteth him of the evil. *Joel ii. 13.*

To the Lord our God belong mercies and forgivenesses, though we have rebelled against him: neither have we obeyed the voice of the Lord our God, to walk in his laws which he set before us. *Dan. ix. 9, 10.*

O Lord, correct me, but with judgment: not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing. *Jer. x. 24. Psal. vi. 1.*

Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand. *St. Mat. iii. 2.*

I will arise, and go to my father; and will say unto him, Father, I have sinned against heaven, and before thee, and am no more worthy to be called thy son. *St. Luke xv. 18, 19.*

Enter not into judgment with thy servant, O Lord; for in thy sight shall no man living be justified. *Psal. cxliii. 2.*

If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us: But if we confess our sins, he is faithful and just to forgive us our sins, and to cleanse us from all unrighteousness. 1 *St. John i. 8, 9.*

DEarly beloved brethren, the scripture moveth us in sundry places to acknowledge and confess our manifold sins and wickedness; and that we should not dissemble nor cloke them before the face of Almighty God our heavenly Father; but confess them with an humble, lowly, penitent, and obedient heart; to the end that we may obtain forgiveness of the same, by his infinite goodness and mercy. And although we

ought at all times humbly to acknowledge our sins before God ; yet ought we chiefly so to do, when we assemble and meet together, to render thanks for the great benefits that we have received at his hands, to set forth his most worthy praise, to hear his most holy word, and to ask those things which are requisite and necessary as well for the body as for the soul. Wherefore I pray and beseech you, as many as are here present, to accompany me with a pure heart and humble voice, unto the throne of the heavenly grace, saying after me :

¶ *A general Confession, to be said by the whole Congregation, after the Minister, all kneeling.*

Almighty and most merciful Father, We have erred and strayed from thy ways like lost sheep : We have followed too much the devices and desires of our own hearts : We have offended against thy holy laws : We have left undone those things which we ought to have done : And we have done those things which we ought not to have done ; And there is no health in us. But thou, O Lord, have mercy upon us, miserable offenders. Spare thou those, O God, who confess their faults : Restore thou those who are penitent ; According to thy promises, declared unto mankind in Christ Jesus our Lord. And grant, O most merciful Father for his sake, That we may hereafter live a godly, righteous and sober life, To the glory of thy holy Name. *Amen.*

¶ *A Declaration concerning the Forgiveness of Sins ; to be made by the Minister alone, standing ; the People still kneeling.*

Almighty God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, desireth not the death of a sinner, but rather that he may turn from his wickedness and live ; and hath given power and commandment to his Ministers, to declare and pronounce to his People, being penitent, the Absolution and Remission of their sins. He pardoneth and absolveth all those who truly repent, and unfeignedly believe his holy Gospel. Wherefore let us beseech him to grant us true repentance, and his holy Spirit ; that those things may please him which we do at this present, and that the rest of our life hereafter may be pure and holy ; so that at the last we may come to his eternal joy, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

¶ *The People shall answer here, and at the end of all other Prayers, Amen.*

¶ *Then the Minister shall kneel, and say the Lord's Prayer with an audible voice ; the People also kneeling, and repeating it with him, both here, and wheresoever else it is used in Divine Service.*

Our Father, who art in Heaven, Hallowed be thy Name ; Thy Kingdom come ; Thy will be done in Earth, As it is in Heaven : Give us this day our daily bread ; And forgive us our trespasses, As we forgive those who trespass against us ; And lead us not into temptation, But deliver us from evil : For thine is the Kingdom, And the Power, And the Glory, For ever and ever. *Amen.*

¶ *Then likewise he shall say,*

O Lord, open thou our lips;

Answ. And our mouth shall shew forth thy praise.

Minister. O God, make speed to save us.

Answ. O Lord, make haste to help us.

¶ *Here all standing up, the Minister shall say,*

Glory be to the Father, and to the Son; and to the Holy Ghost;

Answ. As it was in the beginning, is now, and ever shall be: world without end. Amen.

Minister. Praise ye the Lord.

Answ. The Lord's name be praised.

¶ *Then shall be said or sung, this Psalm following: Except on Easter Day, upon which another Anthem is appointed. Psal. 95.*

O Come, let us sing unto the Lord: let us heartily rejoice in the strength of our salvation.

Let us come before his presence with thanksgiving: and shew ourselves glad in him with psalms.

For the Lord is a great God: and a great King above all gods.

In his hand are all the corners of the earth: and the strength of the hills is his also.

The sea is his, and he made it: and his hands prepared the dry land.

O come, let us worship, and fall down: and kneel before the Lord our Maker.

For he is the Lord our God: and we are the people of his pasture, and the sheep of his hand.

To day if ye will hear his voice, harden not your hearts: as in the provocation, and as in the day of temptation in the wilderness;

When your fathers tempted me: proved me, and saw my works.

Forty years long was I grieved with this generation, and said: It is a people that do err in their hearts, for they have not known my ways:

Unto whom I sware in my wrath: that they should not enter into my rest.

¶ *Then shall follow the Psalms in order as appointed, and instead of saying the Gloria Patri at the end of each Psalm, let it be said only at the end of the whole portion of Psalms; or, in the place thereof, let the following Anthem be said or sung:*

GLORY be to God on high, and in earth peace, good will towards men. We praise thee, we bless thee, we worship thee, we glorify thee, we give thanks to thee for thy great glory, O Lord God, heavenly king, God the Father Almighty.

O Lord, the only begotten Son Jesus Christ; O Lord God, Lamb of God, who hast taken away the sins of the world, and now sittest at the right hand of God the Father, have mercy upon us.

For thou only art holy; thou only art the Lord; thou only, O Christ, with the Holy Ghost, art most high in the Glory of God the Father. Amen.

¶ *Then shall be read the first Lesson, according to the Table or Calendar ; after which shall be said or sung the following Hymn.*

¶ *Note, That before every Lesson the Minister shall say, Here beginneth such a Chapter, or Verse of such a Chapter of such a Book : And after every Lesson, Here endeth the First, or the Second Lesson.*

WE praise thee, O God ; we acknowledge thee to be the Lord.

All the earth doth worship thee ; the Father everlasting.

To thee all Angels cry aloud : the Heavens and all the Powers therein.

To thee Cherubin, and Seraphin : continually do cry,

Holy, Holy, Holy : Lord God of Sabaoth.

Heaven and Earth are full of the Majesty : of thy Glory.

The glorious company of the Apostles : praise thee.

The goodly fellowship of the Prophets : praise thee.

The noble army of Martyrs : praise thee.

The holy Church throughout all the world : doth acknowledge thee ;

The Father : of an infinite Majesty ;

Thine adorable, true : and only Son ;

Also the Holy Ghost : the Comforter.

Thou art the King of Glory : O Christ.

Thou art the everlasting Son : of the Father.

When thou tookest upon thee to deliver man : thou didst humble thyself to be born of a pure Virgin.

When thou hadst overcome the sharpness of death : thou didst open the kingdom of Heaven to all believers.

Thou sittest at the right hand of God : in the Glory of the Father.

We believe that thou shalt come : to be our Judge.

We therefore pray thee, help thy servants : whom thou hast redeemed with thy precious blood.

Make them to be numbered with thy saints : in Glory everlasting.

O Lord, save thy people : and bless thine heritage.

Govern them : and lift them up for ever.

Day by day : we magnify thee ;

And we worship thy Name : ever world without end.

Vouchsafe, O Lord : to keep us this day without sin.

O Lord, have mercy upon us : have mercy upon us.

O Lord, let thy mercy be upon us : as our trust is in thee.

¶ *Then shall be read in like manner the Second Lesson, taken out of the New Testament. And after that, the Hymn following.*

St. Luke 1, 68.

BLessed be the Lord God of Israel : for he hath visited and redeemed his people ;

And hath raised up a mighty salvation for us : in the house of his servant David ;

As he spake by the mouth of his holy Prophets : which have been since the world began ;

That we should be saved from our enemies : and from the hand of all that hate us ;

To perform the mercy promised to our forefathers : and to remember his holy Covenant ;

To perform the oath which he sware to our forefather Abraham : that he would give us ;

That we being delivered out of the hand of our enemies : might serve him without fear,

In holiness and righteousness before him : all the days of our life.

And thou, Child, shalt be called the Prophet of the Highest : for thou shalt go before the face of the Lord to prepare his ways ;

To give knowledge of salvation unto his people : for the remission of their sins,

Through the tender mercy of our God : whereby the Dayspring from on high hath visited us ;

To give light to them that sit in darkness, and in the shadow of death : and to guide our feet into the way of peace.

¶ *Or this.*

Psal. 100.

O Be joyful in the Lord, all ye lands : serve the Lord with gladness, and come before his presence with a song.

Be ye sure that the Lord he is God ; it is he that hath made us, and not we ourselves ; we are his people, and the sheep of his pasture.

O go your way into his gates with thanksgiving, and into his courts with praise : be thankful unto him, and speak good of his Name.

For the Lord is gracious, his mercy is everlasting : and his truth endureth from generation to generation.

¶ *Then shall be said the Apostle's Creed by the Minister and the People, standing.*

I Believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth :

And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord ; Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary, Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead, and buried ; The third day he rose again from the dead ; He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty ; From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost ; The holy Catholick Church ; The Communion of Saints ; The forgiveness of Sins ; The resurrection of the body, and the life everlasting. Amen.

¶ *And after that, these Prayers following, all devoutly kneeling ; the Minister first pronouncing,*

Minister. The Lord be with you :

Answ. And with thy spirit.

¶ *Minister.* Let us pray.

O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us ;

Answ. And grant us thy salvation.

Minister. O Lord, bless and preserve these United States;

Answ. And mercifully hear us; when we call upon thee.

Minister. Endue thy Ministers with righteousness;

Answ. And make thy people joyful.

Minister. O God, make clean our hearts within us;

Answ. And take not thy Holy Spirit from us.

¶ *A Collect for Peace.*

O God, who art the author of peace and lover of concord, in knowledge of whom standeth our eternal life, whose service is perfect freedom; Defend us thy humble servants in all assaults of our enemies; that we surely trusting in thy defence, may not fear the power of any adversaries, through the might of Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

¶ *A Collect for Grace.*

O Lord, our heavenly Father, Almighty and everlasting God, who hast safely brought us to the beginning of this day; Defend us in the same with thy mighty power; and grant that this day we fall into no sin, neither run into any kind of danger; but that all our doings may, by thy governance, be righteous in thy sight, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

¶ *The LITANY, or GENERAL SUPPLICATION, to be used at Morning Service, and at other times as the Minister shall think fit.*

O God the Father of heaven: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

O God the Father of heaven: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

O God the Son, Redeemer of the world: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

O God the Son, Redeemer of the world: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father, and the Son: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

O God the Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father, and the Son: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons, and one God: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

O holy, blessed, and glorious Trinity, three persons, and one God: have mercy upon us miserable sinners.

Remember not, Lord, our offences, nor the offences of our fore-fathers; neither take thou vengeance of our sins: spare us, good Lord, spare thy people, whom thou hast redeemed with thy most precious blood, and be not angry with us for ever.

Spare us, good Lord.

From all evil and mischief; from sin, from the crafts and assaults of the devil; from thy wrath, and from everlasting damnation;

Good Lord, deliver us.

From all blindness of heart ; from pride, vain-glory, and hypocrisy ; from envy, hatred, and malice, and all uncharitableness ;

Good Lord, deliver us.

From fornication, and all other deadly sin ; and from all the deceits of the world, the flesh, and the devil ;

Good Lord, deliver us.

From lightning and tempest ; from plague, pestilence, and famine ; from battle, and murder, and from sudden death ;

Good Lord, deliver us.

From all sedition, privy conspiracy, and rebellion ; from all false doctrine, heresy and schism ; from hardness of heart, and contempt of thy Word and Commandment ;

Good Lord, deliver us.

By the mystery of thy holy Incarnation ; by thy holy Nativity and Circumcision ; by thy Baptism, Fasting and Temptation ;

Good Lord, deliver us.

By thine Agony and bloody Sweat ; by thy Cross and Passion ; by thy precious Death and Burial ; by thy glorious Resurrection and Ascension ; and by the coming of the Holy Ghost ;

Good Lord, deliver us.

In all time of our tribulation ; in all time of our wealth ; in the hour of death, and in the day of judgment ;

Good Lord, deliver us.

We sinners do beseech thee to hear us, O Lord God, and that it may please thee to rule and govern thy holy Church universal in the right way ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to endue the Congress of these United States, and all others in authority, legislative, judicial and executive, with grace, wisdom and understanding ; to execute justice, and to maintain truth ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to illuminate all Bishops, and other Pastors, with true knowledge and understanding of thy Word, and that both by their preaching and living they may set it forth and shew it accordingly ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to bless and keep all thy people ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to give to all Nations unity, peace, and concord ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to give us an heart to love and dread thee, and diligently to live after thy commandments ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to give to all thy people increase of grace, to hear meekly thy Word, and to receive it with pure affection, and to bring forth the fruits of the Spirit ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to bring into the way of truth all such as have erred, and are deceived ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to strengthen such as do stand, and to comfort and help the weak hearted, and to raise up those who fall, and finally to beat down Satan under our feet ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to succour, help, and comfort all who are in danger, necessity, and tribulation ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to preserve all who travel by land or by water, all women in childbirth, all sick persons, and young children, and to shew thy pity upon all prisoners and captives ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to defend, and provide for, the fatherless children, and widows, and all who are desolate and oppressed ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to have mercy upon all men ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to forgive our enemies, persecutors, and slanderers, and to turn their hearts ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to give and preserve to our use the kindly fruits of the earth, so as in due time we may enjoy them ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

That it may please thee to give us true repentance, to forgive us all our sins, negligences, and ignorances, and to endue us with the grace of thy Holy Spirit to amend our lives according to thy holy Word ;

We beseech thee to hear us, good Lord.

Son of God : we beseech thee to hear us.

Son of God : we beseech thee to hear us.

O Lamb of God : who takest away the sins of the world ;

Grant us thy peace.

O Christ, hear us.

O Christ, hear us.

Lord, have mercy upon us, and deal not with us according to our sins.

Neither reward us according to our iniquities.

O God, merciful Father, who despiseth not the sighing of a contrite heart, nor the desire of such as are sorrowful ; Mercifully assist our prayers which we make before thee in all our troubles and adversities whensoever they oppress us ; and graciously hear us, that those evils, which the craft and subtilty of the devil or man worketh against us, may, by thy good providence, be brought to nought ; that we thy servants, being hurt by no persecutions, may evermore give thanks unto thee in thy holy Church, through Jesus Christ our Lord.

O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for thy Name's sake.

O God, we have heard with our ears, and our fathers have declared unto us, the noble works that thou didst in their days, and in the old time before them.

O Lord, arise, help us, and deliver us for thine Honour.

From our enemies defend us, O Christ.

Graciously look upon our afflictions.

Pitifully behold the sorrows of our hearts.

Mercifully forgive the sins of thy people.

Favourably with mercy hear our prayers.

O Son of David, have mercy upon us.

Both now and ever vouchsafe to hear us, O Christ.

Graciously hear us, O Christ; graciously hear us, O Lord Christ.

O Lord, let thy mercy be shewed upon us.

As we do put our trust in thee.

WE humbly beseech thee, O Father, mercifully to look upon our infirmities; and for the glory of thy Name, turn from us all those evils that we most justly have deserved; and grant, that in all our troubles we may put our whole trust and confidence in thy mercy, and evermore serve thee in holiness and pureness of living, to thy honour and glory, through our only Mediator and Advocate Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

Here endeth the LITANY.

¶ *A General Thanksgiving.*

ALMIGHTY God, Father of all mercies, we thine unworthy servants do give thee most humble and hearty thanks for all thy goodness and loving kindness to us, and to all men: [** This to be said when any who have been prayed for, desire to return praise.* *particularly to those who desire now to offer up their praises and thanksgivings for thy late mercies vouchsafed unto them.*] We bless thee for our creation, preservation and all the blessings of this life; but above all, for thine inestimable love in the redemption of the world by our Lord Jesus Christ; for the means of grace, and for the hope of glory. And we beseech thee, give us that due sense of all thy mercies, that our hearts may be unfeignedly thankful, and that we may shew forth thy praise, not only with our lips, but in our lives; by giving up ourselves to thy service, and by walking before thee in holiness and righteousness all our days, through Jesus Christ our Lord; to whom with thee and the Holy Ghost, be all honour and glory, world without end. *Amen.*

¶ *A Prayer of St. Chrysostom.*

ALMIGHTY God, who hast given us grace at this time with one accord to make our common supplications unto thee; and dost promise, that when two or three are gathered together in thy Name, thou wilt grant their requests; fulfil now, O Lord, the desires and petitions of thy servants, as may be most expedient for them; granting us in this world knowledge of thy truth, and in the world to come life everlasting. *Amen.*

2 Cor. 13, 14.

THE grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Love of God, and the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, be with us all evermore. *Amen.*

Here endeth the Morning Prayer.

The ORDER for Daily EVENING PRAYER.

¶ *The EVENING PRAYER is to be read the same as MORNING PRAYER, to the Answer, "The Lord's name be praised," preceding the Psalms; then shall be said or sung the Psalms in Order as they are appointed, with the Doxology, as in the Morning Service; then the Lesson from the Old Testament; after which this HYMN:*

St. Luke 1, 46.

MY soul doth magnify the Lord; and my spirit hath rejoiced in God my Saviour.

For he hath regarded: the lowliness of his hand-maiden.

For behold, from henceforth: all generations shall call me blessed.

For he that is mighty hath magnified me: and holy is his Name.

And his mercy is on them that fear him: throughout all generations.

He hath shewed strength with his arm: He hath scattered the proud in the imagination of their hearts.

He hath put down the mighty from their seat: and hath exalted the humble and meek.

He hath filled the hungry with good things: and the rich he hath sent empty away.

He remembering his mercy hath holpen his servant Israel: as he promised to our fore-fathers, Abraham and his seed, for ever.

¶ *Or else this. Psal. 98.*

O Sing unto the Lord a new song: for he hath done marvellous things.

With his own right hand, and with his holy arm: hath he gotten himself the victory.

The Lord declared his salvation: his righteousness hath he openly shewed in the sight of the heathen.

He hath remembered his mercy and truth towards the house of Israel: and all the ends of the world have seen the salvation of our God.

Shew yourselves joyful unto the Lord, all ye lands: sing, rejoice, and give thanks.

Praise the Lord upon the harp: sing to the harp with a psalm of thanksgiving.

With trumpets also and shawms: O shew yourselves joyful before the Lord the King.

Let the sea make a noise, and all that therein is: the round world and they that dwell therein.

Let the floods clap their hands, and let the hills be joyful together before the Lord: for he cometh to judge the earth.

With righteousness shall he judge the world : and the people with equity.

¶ *Then a Lesson of the New Testament, as it is appointed : And after that, shall be sung or said this hymn.*

St. Luke 2. 29.

Lord, now lettest thou thy servant depart in peace : according to thy word.

For mine eyes have seen : thy salvation.

Which thou hast prepared : before the face of all people ;

To be a light to lighten the Gentiles : and to be the glory of thy people Israel.

¶ *Or else this. Psal. 67.*

God be merciful unto us, and bless us : and shew us the light of his countenance, and be merciful unto us :

That thy way may be known upon earth : thy saving health among all nations.

Let the people praise thee, O God : yea, let all the people praise thee.

O let the nations rejoice and be glad : for thou shalt judge the folk righteously, and govern the nations upon earth.

Let the people praise thee, O God : yea, let all the people praise thee.

Then shall the earth bring forth her increase : and God, even our own God, shall give us his blessing.

God shall bless us : and all the ends of the world shall fear him.

¶ *Then shall be said the Apostles Creed by the Minister and the People, standing.*

I Believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth :

And in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord ; Who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, Born of the Virgin Mary, Suffered under Pontius Pilate, Was crucified, dead, and buried ; The third day he rose again from the dead, He ascended into heaven, And sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty ; From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost ; The Holy Catholic Church ; The Communion of Saints ; The forgiveness of Sins ; The resurrection of the body, And the life everlasting. Amen.

¶ *And after that, these Prayers following, all devoutly kneeling ; the Minister first pronouncing,*

The Lord be with you :

Answ. And with thy Spirit.

¶ *Minister.* Let us pray.

O Lord, shew thy mercy upon us ;

Answ. And grant us thy salvation.

Minister. O Lord, bless and preserve these United States.

Answ. And mercifully hear us, when we call upon thee.

Minister. Endue thy Ministers with righteousness ;

Answ. And make thy people joyful.

Minister. O God, make clean our hearts within us ;

Answ. And take not thy Holy Spirit from us.

C O L L E C T S.

O God, from whom all holy desires, all good counsels, and all just works do proceed ; Give unto thy servants that peace, which the world cannot give ; that both our hearts may be set to obey thy commandments, and also that by thee we being defended from the fear of our enemies, may pass our time in rest and quietness, through the merits of Jesus Christ our Saviour. *Amen.*

Enlighten our minds, O Lord, we beseech thee, with thy truth ; and by thy great mercy defend us from all perils and dangers of this night, for the love of thy only Son our Saviour Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

¶ *These four Prayers following, are always to be used in the Evening Service, and at other Times when the Litany is not said.*

¶ *A Prayer for the Congress.*

Most gracious God, we humbly beseech thee, as for these *United States* in general, so especially for their Delegates in Congress : that thou wouldest be pleased to direct and prosper all their consultations to the advancement of thy Glory, the good of thy Church, the safety, honour and welfare of thy people ; that all things may be so ordered and settled by their endeavours, upon the best and surest foundations, that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may be established among us for all generations. These and all other necessities for them, for us, and thy whole Church, we humbly beg in the Name and mediation of Jesus Christ our most blessed Lord and Saviour. *Amen.*

¶ *A Prayer for our Civil Rulers.*

O Lord our heavenly Father, the high and mighty Ruler of the Universe, who dost from thy throne behold all the dwellers upon earth ; most heartily we beseech thee with thy favour to behold all in authority, legislative, judicial and executive, in these *United States* ; and so replenish them with the grace of thy Holy Spirit, that they may always incline to thy will, and walk in thy way : Endue them plenteously with heavenly gifts ; grant them in health and wealth long to live ; and finally, after this life, to attain everlasting joy and felicity, through Jesus Christ our Lord. *Amen.*

¶ *A Prayer for the Clergy and People.*

Almighty and everlasting God, send down upon all Bishops and other Pastors, and the Congregations committed to their charge, the healthful Spirit of thy grace ; and that they may truly please thee, pour upon them the continual dew of thy blessing : Grant this, O Lord, for the honour of our Advocate and Mediator Jesus Christ. *Amen.*

¶ *A Prayer for all Conditions of Men.*

O God, the Creator and Preserver of all mankind, we humbly beseech thee for all sorts and conditions of men, that thou wouldest be pleased to make thy ways known unto them, thy saving health unto all nations. More especially we pray for thy holy Church universal; that it may be so guided and governed by thy good Spirit, that all who profess and call themselves Christians, may be led into the way of truth, and hold the faith in unity of spirit, in the bond of peace, and in righteousness of life. Finally we commend to thy Fatherly goodness, all those who are any ways afflicted or distressed in mind, body, or

** This to be said when any desire the prayers of the Congregation.* estate; [** especially those for whom our prayers are desired*]; that it may please thee to comfort and relieve them, according to their several necessities, giving them patience under their sufferings, and a happy issue out of all their afflictions: And this we beg for Jesus Christ's sake. *Amen.*

¶ *Then the General Thanksgiving and Prayer of St. Chrysostom and the blessing, as in the Morning Service.*

Here endeth the Evening Prayer.

BOOK NOTICES.

BIBLICAL COMMENTARY ON THE NEW TESTAMENT. By Dr. HERMANN OLSHAUSEN, Professor of Theology in the University of Erlangen. Translated from the German for Clark's Foreign and Theological Library. First American Edition, revised after the Fourth German Edition, by A. C. KENDRICK, D. D., Professor of Greek in the University of Rochester. To which is prefixed Olshausen's Proof of the Genuineness of the writings of the New Testament, Translated by DAVID FOSDICK, Jr. In six volumes. 8vo. pp. 621, 624, 615, 586, 624. New York: Sheldon, Blakeman & Co. 1857-58.

We regret to be compelled to speak of this work within the brief limits of a Book Notice; and more especially as we differ somewhat in our judgment of the Commentary from the opinions hitherto expressed, as far as we have seen, by the Church press. We own to a very strong conviction as to the inherent character of German speculation, and to its inevitable tendency, when applied to Biblical interpretation. Ten years of daily intimacy with one of the best German scholars in this country, who had made German Theology and German Philosophy a specialty in his studies, has given us some opportunity of watching the phases of this modern German movement. Olshausen is undoubtedly one of the very best of Modern German Commentators. Our objection to him is one which lies primarily against the whole system of interpretation of the Modern German School, and against the test to which these men insist on bringing God's Revealed Word. While we have no more idea of resolving heresy into a mere question of races, than we have of resolving crime into a mere question of physiological conformations, yet there does seem to be something in the Germanic intellect constitutionally facile to skepticism. Everything, human and divine, finite and infinite, it subjects to the sole tribunal of Human Reason. Inspiration, Miracles, Sacraments, Institutions, all must bow before the throne of this omnipotent, infallible Ego. Now if, as we most cheerfully grant, Olshausen is often right in his conclusions, if he is always learned, is usually devout in his tone, and often kindles with the warmth and fire of religious feeling; if he is practical and subjective in his teaching, and if, as we grant, he oftentimes throws floods of light upon a passage by the affluence and philological accuracy of his learning, still we must not forget that the very same system of exegesis has conducted DeWette and Strauss, and Paulus, to widely different results. Nor is Olshausen always to be trusted in his conclusions. The American Editor admits, that "he speculates sometimes with a subtlety, and sometimes with a mysticism, characteristically German, and sometimes bends philology to the support of the favorite heresies of the German theologians." This admission, from such a source, is broad enough, and strong enough, to cover all that we might wish to say on this point. We gave our opinions on some of these German heresies and Platonic idealities, in the Jan. No. of the Eighth Volume of this Review, and to that Article we refer the reader. There is not learning enough in Christendom to redeem such speculations from condemnation.

Olshausen belongs, it is said, to a different School of theology. And yet in respect to the Miracles of our Saviour, he regards the "pool of Bethesda" (St. John v. 2-9) as a "medicinal spring," and says that "the water from time to time fitfully bubbled, and in such seasons the greatest efficacy was ascribed to it." As to the movement of the water being ascribed to an angel, he says, "even the best modern expositors, Lucke and Tholuck, regard this as a legend." Thus much as to Miracles; though he is not always so rationalistic as in this instance.

In respect to the Constitution of the Ministry, Olshausen, or rather Wiesinger, (who with Dr. Ebrard finished the work from the point where Olshausen was in-

terrputed by his death,) says, "that the expression *presbuteroi* designates the same office as *episcopoi*, is acknowledged by all who can acknowledge it."

In respect to the Sacraments, Olshausen is nearer orthodoxy in his teachings; but yet he comes far short of the full avowals of the German Reformed School in this country. Thus in the proof text, (St. John vi, 51-53,) he acknowledges that our Saviour had reference to the Lord's Supper; and yet not to the Sacrament, but to the "*idea* of the Sacrament." And so also of Baptism; he says that that strong text (St. John iii, 6) has "a reference to baptism, though that reference is not to the sacrament, but to the *idea* of baptism." And even this qualified language is still further frittered away by the American Editor.

And so, also, in respect to the doctrine of Original Sin; while the doctrine itself is recognized, yet it is so entangled with German speculations, that the reader finds himself looking at it in a rationalistic point of view; and divested of those bold outlines of fact, with which the Scriptures represent it.

We greatly regret that the work of editing the American Edition did not fall into the hands of one who sympathizes with our Formularies of Faith; and who would have poured upon it the reflected light of wisdom, learning, and piety, gathered from the Early and modern Church. Prof. Kendrick has vastly improved the English translation in a scholarly point of view, but has failed to render the Commentary altogether acceptable to American Churchmen, either in respect to Doctrine or Discipline.

We are pained to speak in this language, of caution and qualification, of a work on which such a profusion of learning has been expended. In certain departments of learning, especially in Philology and its cognate branches, the modern Germans have taken the lead in profound scholarship among European scholars. In Biblical criticism, the Commentary before us is the very best fruit of that scholarship. While it will be studied for the illumination it casts upon the text of the sacred page, the reader should guard against its rationalistic tendencies, as well as against the conclusions to which it often leads him.

Five volumes of this Commentary have already appeared in the American edition; a sixth and concluding one will soon be published. Olshausen carried the Commentary through the Gospels, the Acts, and the Epistles to the Romans, Corinthians, Galatians, Colossians, Ephesians, and Thessalonians; and at his death, Ebrard completed the Exposition of Hebrews, and the Revelation; and Wiesinger has finished his Commentary upon Philippians, the Pastoral Epistles, St. James, and 1st of St. Peter; and is now employed on the other Catholic Epistles. Prof. Kendrick has taken some liberties with the authors in the way of condensation; and still more with the English Translation from the German.

LECTURES ON THE HISTORY OF ANCIENT PHILOSOPHY. By WILLIAM ARCHER BUTLER, M. A., late Professor of Moral Philosophy in the University of Dublin. Edited from the Author's MSS., with Notes by WILLIAM HEPWORTH THOMPSON, M. A., Fellow of Trinity College, and Regius Professor of Greek in the University of Cambridge. In two volumes. 12mo. pp. 436, 415. Philadelphia: Parry & McMillan. 1857.

This work is too full of matter to be digested in a mere notice, and our thinking readers will be gratified with an appreciative examination of it in our next Number.

THE TESTIMONY OF THE ROCKS; or Geology in its Bearings on the Two Theologies, Natural and Revealed. By HUGH MILLER, Author of "Old Red Sandstone," &c. With Memorials of the Death and Character of the Author. 12mo. pp. 502. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857.

There is no department of Physical Science which seems destined to struggle with such difficulties as Geology; and, not one, which is pursued so unphilosophically on the part of its devotees. Men first frame their theories, and then attempt to make facts bend to them; or from a few unconnected isolated phenomena, they jump at conclusions which more perfect investigations are sure to upset; and attempt to reach and establish general principles without submitting

to the previous study of particular facts. Geology is saddled with another load of difficulties. Infidels have thought they had found in its disclosures facts irreconcilable with the Mosaic account of the Creation; first, as to time; and then, as to *causation*. They profess to have discovered certain powers in nature, or certain plastic and spermatogenic qualities in matter, by which not only vegetable but animal life, instead of owing its existence to the creative power of God, came into being by certain natural laws. And so, by mere development, there is first the monad, then the animalcule, the mollusk, the reptile, the bird, the quadruped, the monkey, the ourang-outang, and then, at last, and finally, Man! And all this, in accordance with the *Novum Organum*! That these philosophers are worthy of the origin to which they would carry back the human race, we will not deny; but, after all, is there the least plausibility in the theory? The author of the "Vestiges of Creation" affirmed it; and so have Lamarck, and Oken, and Maillet. This theory, Hugh Miller refuted so effectually in his "Footprints of the Creator," that we believe it is now thoroughly abandoned. Brewster, also, and Lyell, have exposed its utter folly, and on principles of the soundest philosophy. If anything could be wanting to complete the argument, late fossil discoveries, by Mr. Beckles, in Dorsetshire, of numerous perfectly organized mammalia, and of at least fourteen different species, in *secondary rocks*, have exploded the "Development Theory" into a thousand fragments.

But Mr. Miller, in the volume before us, seems to us to have been guilty, in some respects, of violating the rules of fair induction, not less really than the men whose infidel speculations he has overthrown. In this work, he examines what he calls the Palaeontological History of Plants and Animals; The Two Records, Mosaic and Geological, and the Mosaic vision of Creation; Geology and the Two Theologies; The Noachian Deluge; The Distinctive Provinces of Natural and Revealed Theology, and the Geology of the Anti-Geologists; and the less known Fossil Floras of Scotland. We do not hesitate to say, that Mr. Miller has taken ground on some of these points, which has greatly gratified those men who are engaged in sapping the foundations of the Christian Faith. Thus, on the "Noachian Deluge," as he calls it, his proofs in favor of only a partial inundation are neither new nor satisfactory; while the tone of his argument is altogether unworthy of the author.

In respect to the great question, of the length of time in the work of the Creation, and the harmony of the Mosaic narrative in the first chapter of Genesis with the discoveries of Science, his theory is, that the Mosaic record gives simply *the order and succession of appearances* as they would appear to an eye-witness, or to the eye of the seer turned backward; and that that record is not to be tested either in this, or in other matters, by its truthfulness to scientific facts; but to the *order and succession of appearances*. And, in this sense, he maintains that the Mosaic record is confirmed by Geology. He claims, that Geological discoveries, and that too by universal consent, range themselves under three great parts, or divisions; characterized, severally, by their *floral, reptilian, and mammalian* forms of life; and that these agree indisputably with the Mosaic history of the third, fifth, and sixth days of the Creation. At the close of the sixth day man comes upon the stage; and then, God rests from His work, save in the work of man's redemption. Of course, Mr. Miller holds that these periods must have been of indefinite and very prolonged existence. We commend his fourth Lecture to those who wish for a clear and forcible statement of the facts of the question, clothed, too, in the most eloquent diction.

On this whole subject, we venture to say, that Geology, as a science, is yet in its infancy. Even its elementary facts, on points, too, of vital importance to the system as such, its most learned professors are at loggerheads about. And yet the field of observation is, for obvious reasons, most difficult to explore. To collect together a sufficient number of well authenticated facts, to classify these facts, and then to draw the lessons which they teach us, is a work yet to be done. Twenty years' history of this Geological question, has shown at least this, that believers in Revelation have as yet nothing to fear from men who

fight the Ark of God from behind the Mask of Science, and who are either the merest Sciolists in their own profession, or at utter disagreement among themselves. Voltaire studied Calmet, not to solve difficulties, but to find them. Of the Bible itself, he was an ignoramus. In this, Voltaire was not alone. So, also, the famous Zodiac of Dendera, which the French infidels made to be at least 17,000 years old, is found, at last, to date back to the year A. D. 37. Christians, while they have nothing to fear from attacks like these, yet may not hope to silence assault by merely denouncing infidelity and German rationalism, while they shut their eyes to the unquestionable discoveries of Modern Science.

Hugh Miller was born in the North of Scotland, Oct. 10, 1802, and died by his own hand, Dec. 23, 1856. He was a remarkable man, self-educated, a sturdy Presbyterian, a vigorous controversialist, and a racy, forcible writer. "The Testimony of the Rocks," was his last work; and the labor and excitement of its preparation was the proximate cause of his melancholy death.

LIFE OF JAMES MONTGOMERY. By MRS. HELEN C. KNIGHT, Author of "Lady Huntington and her Friends," etc. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857. 12mo. pp. 416.

The place which James Montgomery fills, and will continue to fill, in the hearts of Christians, is too large to let his memory perish. A Scotchman by birth, though of Irish descent, a Moravian in Religion, yet of broad and most genial sympathies, it is as the "Sheffield Bard," or rather as the "Christian Poet," that his name will live forever in the Church militant. Pounced upon by Jeffrey with an almost savage ferocity in the *Edinburgh Review*, almost eclipsed in the popular mind for the time, by his contemporaries, Byron, and Coleridge, and Wordsworth, and Scott, he has yet left behind him a deathless fame. The finest Missionary Hymn in our language, "Oh Spirit of the Living God," and that beautiful lyric, "Glory to the Father give," which has attuned the heart to heavenly music of many a sweet child now in Paradise,—so, also, those popular lyrics, "Who are these in bright array," and, "O where shall rest be found," were his, and have given him a reputation which will outlast all that ever came from the resplendent genius of those men; for it is a reputation luminous in a light which no darkness can ever hide. His poetry is characterized by great tenderness of feeling, boldness of imagery, a rich and flowing harmony, and the outgushing of a full, broken, contrite heart, in language of perfect simplicity and truthfulness. Early and more thorough culture would have widened the range of his muse, and given him higher rank as a literary man; but we question if it would have added sweetness or richness to his verse as a Christian poet. It would have spoiled Burns; it might have spoiled Montgomery. His religious character possessed all that simplicity and intense subjectivity which the followers of Zinzendorf have so often evinced; and there is a peculiar tenderness and depth of tone in his piety, evidently imparted to it by the Moravian Ritual, and which, a Churchman regards as most truly saint-like. Mrs. Knight has sketched his character, and given the leading points in his history, neatly and forcibly. She has also preserved some valuable letters of Southey and Wordsworth. The early life of Montgomery was chequered by wayward, rather than vicious follies, and gave little promise of realizing the expectations and prayers of his parents, who were missionaries to the West India Islands. As Editor at Sheffield, he was constantly embroiled for a time in troubles with the Government, on account of his sympathy with the French Revolutionists. If there was little in his whole career which the world will mark as great or heroic, yet that true piety which lives nearest the Cross will trace his history with gratitude and pleasure.

ESSAYS IN BIOGRAPHY AND CRITICISM. By PETER BAYNE, M. A. First Series. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857.

Mr. Bayne made his appearance amongst us a year or two ago, as the author of a volume entitled *The Christian Life*, which, his publishers say, "men of all de-

nominations agree in pronouncing one of the most admirable works of the age." This is exceedingly probable, works of all sorts and kinds being daily pronounced the most admirable of the age; but for this very reason, the commendation is hardly decisive. We have never read the book, and we candidly confess that we have no desire of reading it, if it resembles the book before us. A less prepossessing production than this volume of *Essays* has not fallen into our hands for a long time.

Mr. Bayne is wholly destitute of the first charm which attracts us to an unknown writer. He has no idea, apparently, of modesty, or of its influence on thought or style. What he thinks, or assumes to think, is thrust directly into our faces; we must accept it, he says, or we have nothing worth accepting. He is especially severe upon critics who differ from him. "Dear, pedantic critic," is a phrase of his more playful moments; "grandiose mediocrity" betrays rising excitement; and the full burst of his displeasure brings out "the pretentious feebleness of the Quarterly, the insolence of the Edinburgh, and the baseness of Blackwood." Doubting his own power, or his own judgment, is not his habit. "It is perhaps not too presumptuous to say that I have exhibited some little capacity at least for the enjoyment of Tennyson's poetry." "Sir Archibald Alison," says the preface, "has testified to the correctness of the view given of his political theories; and it may be added, that Mr. DeQuincey expressed a very favorable opinion of the essay to which his name is appended." It is true that Mr. Bayne occasionally hints at defects of which he is sensible; but such a suggestion we have found to be almost universally followed up by a fresh assertion of his merits. The self-complacency of the preface is positively offensive.

Well, and what is the book? Eight *Essays* on DeQuincey, Tennyson, Mrs. Browning, Recent British Art, Ruskin, Hugh Miller, The Modern Novel, and Currier Bell. We are promised a second series upon kindred subjects; but though we had both volumes, we might find it difficult to determine why these writings should ever have been collected. They are not, of course, without their good points; yet, even passing by their bad points, we do not readily see in their good ones sufficient reasons for this deliberate republication. The publishers, unquestionably, find it for their interest to issue the volumes; the newspaper critics applaud them, the public buy them. But the inherent claims of the *Essays* to the renewed consideration of any thoughtful mind, are really quite undistinguishable. It is not the style, assuredly, which entitles these productions to lasting regard. There are animated, and occasionally striking passages, but the effect of the whole is of a strained and arrogant character. In a word, it is the *sensation* style, which Mr. Bayne has adopted. We have no room for extracts on this point; a few phrases, taken here and there, will show which way the wind blows throughout the volume. We read of "the grand physiognomic outlines of DeQuincey's mind," "the icy guerdon of a pedant's approbation," "weak, Wordsworthian self-canonization," "tip-toe mediocrity," and of a hundred other statements equally true to taste and to nature.

Is it the critical power of the author, his judgment upon the great principles of literature or of life, that commends his *Essays*? He shall answer the question for himself. In the paper on Mrs. Browning, after shaking his head at the "petrified aristocratism of antiquity," and then sneering at "that narrow chamber, narrowing with every generation, in which Gray, Collins and such erudite minstrels, receive frost bitten compliments from critics and pedants," he says, "I deliberately assign her (Mrs. Browning) the same place among women as Shakespeare occupied among men." To expound or write of this stamp, he may well call "an august task." "I know not where," he exclaims over a passage from the *Drama of Exile*, "out of sacred writ, a pathos more sublime is attained." "Mrs. Browning has drunk more freely of the Gospel," declares the critic, "and it may even be, looked with greater earnestness and amazement upon certain of its most sublime facts, than Milton."

We have had no pleasure in making these brief comments upon Mr. Bayne's *Essays*. Indeed, we shrank from writing a word about the volume, after turning over its pages as it first fell into our hands. But to say, in a few lines, what we

thought of it, to deny its claims to circulation, or to influence among our householders, seemed to be a duty as incumbent as it has been painful.

BRAZIL AND THE BRAZILIANS, Portrayed in Historical and Descriptive Sketches By Rev. D. P. KIDDER, D. D., and Rev. J. C. FLETCHER. Illustrated by one hundred and fifty Engravings. Philadelphia: Childs & Peterson. 1857. 8vo. pp. 630.

This work deserves more than a passing notice, and will afford the subject and abundant materials for an Article on Brazil, which we design shall appear in an early Number of the *Church Review*. The volume is not the production of one of our professional book-makers; it is a solid contribution to Geographical Science by men who have spent twenty years in Brazil, and is the most complete description of that country which has ever been given to the public. The publishers have "brought out" the work with a liberality lavish of expense; and it deserves a place in every library by the side of their late publication the "Arctic Explorations" by Dr. Kane. A general diffusion of the information which the volume contains would effect important changes in our commercial intercourse with Brazil; an intercourse by which the British are already reaping such rich harvests; and would open new fields of missionary effort on the part of the Church of the most promising character.

THE GREYSON LETTERS: Selections from the Correspondence of R. E. H. Greyson, Esq. Edited by HENRY ROGERS, Author of "The Eclipse of Faith," etc Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857. 12mo. pp. 518.

In our April No. 1853, we took occasion, in reviewing Mr. Rogers' "Eclipse of Faith," to speak of the assaults of the author on the strongest ramparts of infidelity, and to commend the method of his attack. He does not stop to plead for Christianity, nor to answer, for the thousandth time, petty cavils and sneering innuendoes. Turning the weapons of modern skeptics upon themselves, he shows them, with merciless point and force, that they have no retreat from their position, but in the baldest Atheism. These "Greyson Letters," "edited by Henry Rogers," are Mr. Rogers' own productions. The Advertisement to the American Edition says, that this work shows the author "to be not the inferior of Charles Lamb as a humorist." But we do not think Mr. Rogers to be a humorist at all. He exhibits keen wit and biting sarcasm; and he has a deep, rich vein of strong common sense; he is sometimes playful; but as for genuine humor, we really do not think he has a bit of it in him. Speculative controversy is his strong forte, but he writes pleasantly on a great variety of subjects, from Metaphysics to Mesmerism, and from Cookery to true Catholicism. On this last point, a keen antagonist would send him limping from the field; formal, objective Christianity as an organic Institution, he evidently has little conception of. But his work will do good, in quieting a great deal of senseless prattle against orthodox Christianity, and it amuses while it instructs. We notice that the author has recently become Principal of Lancashire Independent College.

THE CITY OF THE GREAT KING; OR JERUSALEM AS IT WAS, AS IT IS, AND AS IT IS TO BE. By J. T. BARCLAY, M. D., Missionary to Jerusalem. New York: Stanford & Delisser. 1858. 8vo. pp. 627.

Numerous and valuable as have been recent descriptive works on the HOLY CITY, this large volume of Dr. Barclay, in several important particulars, surpasses them all in interest. The author, who is an American, resided in Jerusalem nearly four years. By his medical skill he secured the gratitude of the Turkish Effendi, who was sent by the Sultan as architect to repair the Moske of Omar and other sacred Mohammedan buildings; and being a skillful draughtsman, an experienced chemist, and having some philosophical instruments, he became at the request of that Turkish official, associated with him in designing necessary repairs, alterations, &c. in the Mohammedan temples. By this means he gained free

access to buildings hitherto impenetrable to Christians since the days of Frank domination. His descriptions and photographic sketches, for example, of THE MOSK OF OMAR, which is on Mount Moriah, and covers the site of the Holy of Holies of the Jewish Temple, and of his visits to the subterranean caves of Mount Bezetha, where the stone was quarried for the walls and palaces of the city, are new, and have the value of discoveries. Fourteen chapters treat of Jerusalem "as it was;" and six describe the city "as it is." With regard to Jerusalem "as it is to be," Dr. Barclay is a thorough literalist. The volume is profusely illustrated; and photographs taken on the spot, and with a view to topographical illustration, and the numerous maps which are entirely original, the author claims to be perfectly reliable. While Dr. Barclay agrees with Dr. Robinson generally as to sacred localities, he yet differs from him in several important particulars. The book will assuredly find its way into our family, Sunday School, and Parish Libraries.

BIOGRAPHY OF ELISHA KENT KANE. By WILLIAM ELDER. Philadelphia: 1858. 8 vo. pp. 416.

The Life of Dr. Kane, advertised to appear in May last, has at length been published. The author pleads as reason for the delay, the impossibility of earlier securing the information necessary to prepare the work. The public, we may almost say the world, are familiar with the exploits, the discoveries, the heroism, and the sufferings of Dr. KANE. What Dr. Elder has attempted, is a full and faithful portrait of the man himself. Dr. Kane was a remarkable man. There were rare traits of character in him, and still more rarely are they found blended in such beautiful combination and symmetrical proportion. None but a master can do justice to his memory; for none but a master can appreciate him. Dr. Elder has given us the details of his life fully, and we presume accurately; and has enumerated and illustrated the varied claims of Dr. Kane to the respect and gratitude of his country. Fully one half of the matter of the volume is made up of letters to the publishers by Dr. Hayes, Amos Bonsall, and Henry Goodfellow, who were members of Dr. Kane's Expedition; and also of an account of the honors paid to his memory on the occasion of his decease, by various civic, literary, and scientific bodies. This last, and large portion of the volume, was prepared by the Hon. JOSEPH R. CHANDLER. Mr. Elder says in his Introduction, "I think I have not diluted my narrative with anything except my own personality,—for which I respectfully refuse to offer either justification or apology." If we cannot but pause for a moment over such a passage, and not a few others of a similar tone, in the life of such a man as Dr. Kane, still the severest judgment will not withhold the tribute of gratitude to the author for the reverent devotion with which he has attempted the features of the noble subject of his labors.

HEAVEN; Or, an Earnest and Scriptural Inquiry into the Abode of the Sainted Dead. By the Rev. H. HARBAUGH, Pastor of the First German Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa. Thirteenth Edition. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1857. 12mo. pp. 290.

THE HEAVENLY RECOGNITION, Or an Earnest and Scriptural Discussion of the Question, Will we know our Friends in Heaven? By Rev. H. HARBAUGH. Eleventh Edition. Philadelphia: Lindsay & Blakiston. 1858. 12mo. pp. 288.

We take pleasure, and are sure that we do our readers a kindness, in calling their attention to these volumes of the Rev. Mr. Harbaugh. They both treat of subjects on which, if little is actually revealed, yet our conceptions in their shaping, distinctness, and power, will depend upon our views of the nature of CHRIST'S Kingdom. The author belongs to that German Reformed School to which we have so pointedly referred in our present No. of the *Review*, and concerning which we shall have more to say hereafter. These men, in their teachings

of the nature of the Church and of the Sacraments, of the powers and functions of the Ministry, &c., are so Orthodox, and so little removed from the teachings of the Church, that a mere speculation separates them from us. But, alas! a speculation to the mind of a German is a vast reality.

These books are written in the full consciousness and deep appreciation of the verity of our living Union with CHRIST, and of the communion of saints, the living and the dead with CHRIST, and with each other, in virtue of that union. The first of these volumes is much the least satisfactory to us of the two; is most speculative, and on many points, least conclusive. Yet it is full of rich thoughts, and will conduce to the edification of all who read it in a right spirit. Strange indeed it is, that Heaven, which lies so near us, where all our treasures are, or ought to be laid up, and of which so much is clearly revealed, holds so small a place in our thoughts and anticipations. Mr. Harbaugh discusses the proposition, that Heaven is a *place*, not a mere *state*; also, the question, Where is Heaven? He aims to prove that the Saints do, at death, immediately pass into Heaven; and has a valuable chapter on the Sympathy between Heaven and Earth. In his chapter on the Intermediate State, (which state he denies,) he seems to have confounded the *theories* concerning that state which obtained in the Early Church, and the errors which at an early day grew out of the Gnostic Philosophy, with the Doctrine itself which has always been held and taught in the Church. He says that "the idea is held most extensively in the Episcopal Communion," that "there is something *remedial* connected with this place." We beg to assure Mr. Harbaugh, that he has, doubtless unintentionally, but most grossly and grievously misrepresented us on this point. We know of no standard writer among us who does not teach the doctrine; nor of one who admits such a *remedial* process or efficacy. On this point the author is all wrong, as to his teaching; as he certainly is in this particular statement. Indeed, in his other and subsequent volume, he makes admissions, which, in our judgment, overthrow his own arguments.

The other work, "The Heavenly Recognition," is written with more care, more learning, with less of ideal and individual speculation, and is in all respects a delightful book. The author traces the doctrine of the "Heavenly Recognition," in the light of pagan tradition, and heathen philosophy; of a universal belief, hope, and desire; of Reason; of Jewish opinion and sentiment; of CHRIST's teaching; and in the teaching of the Apostles, the Christian Fathers, Theologians, and the Poets. He also meets the objections to the doctrine; and, in his concluding chapter, notices the influence of this doctrine in its practical effects. This sentiment, thoroughly embraced by multitudes of the noblest and best minds of our race, has been embalmed in language befitting such a theme, and the volume abounds in extracts full of beauty and power. If any of our readers have been called to bury in the grave much, or most, of what bound them to earth, we know that their stricken hearts will be comforted by such abundant evidences of a sweet reunion and recognition so soon awaiting them beyond the veil.

"Tis sweet, as year by year we lose
Friends out of sight, in faith to muse
How grows in Paradise our store."

AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF PHILOSOPHY, WITH AN OUTLINE-TREATISE ON LOGIC. By REV. E. V. GERHART, D. D., President of Franklin and Marshall College. pp. 358. 12mo. Lindsay & Blakiston. Philadelphia: 1858.

The original portion of this work is the "Introduction," which extends to the 208th page. The Logic is "a free and somewhat amplified translation of a German work, by Dr. Beck, originally published at Stuttgart, in 1845." It is, as its name implies, a mere "outline"—the briefest that has fallen in our way. But it is luminous and suggestive; and well adapted to second the instructor who possesses in himself large resources of illustration and exposition with which to clothe with warm living flesh the skeleton of the text-book. We think, indeed, that this would be the best mode of preparing all text-books, if teachers were, even generally, what their name implies, and not mere machines for grinding out recitations.

We have examined the Introduction to Philosophy with no common interest, and we regard it as a really valuable contribution to the department of the higher Metaphysics. The author is an earnest Christian thinker, and there is a freshness and vigor in his thinking which is very attractive. He is a pupil of the late Dr. Rauch, to whose "Memory" he dedicates these first fruits (as we believe) of his labor in that noble field, which his master so successfully cultivated. The influence of Dr. Rauch's teaching is seen at various points, especially in the view which is taken of the organic unity of soul and body. Dr. Gerhart shows great familiarity with German modes of thought, and a strong bias towards that idealism which is at once the glory and the shame of Germany. The *Reason* is the great faculty in his system, and all else is kept in due subordination to this noblest of man's powers by which he is made partaker in the divine reason—the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world. *Christ* is the centre of his philosophy. And that perplexing *dualism*, which has been the bane of nearly every system which the world has yet seen, is here solved in the *God-man*—who unites in Himself finite and infinite. Philosophy is subordinate to Christianity. The doctrine clearly revealed, rules the idea. Religion is no longer, as with Cousin, a department of Philosophy and subject to her laws, but Philosophy is the reverent, ready handmaid of Religion. It is not our purpose, at present, to show how the author unfolds and maintains his system. That we propose to do on a future occasion, when we shall take the opportunity to point out certain features of his theory which we cannot accept. We refer particularly—and we will now simply indicate the reference—to his doctrine of three coördinate ideas—self-consciousness, world-consciousness, and God-consciousness. In relation to the latter, the following view is put forth: "The reason refers itself to God under all the forms of its activity in virtue of its nature; that is, no third entity intervenes between the reason and God, from which the idea of God is derived. If the reason be but normally developed, the idea is evolved out of its own being as an original element, or an immediate fact of consciousness." Of the truth of this proposition so boldly and clearly enunciated, we entertain the gravest doubts. Our reasons for doubting, we reserve till we have more leisure to state them.

MENTAL PHILOSOPHY, INCLUDING THE INTELLECT, SENSIBILITIES, AND WILL. By JOSEPH HAVEN, Professor of Intellectual and Moral Philosophy in Amherst College. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 12mo. pp. 590.

The Author indicates in his title-page the division of powers which he adopts. It is the one now generally received. Great errors were committed by writers in times gone by, in consequence of their failing to distinguish between these several parts of our nature. For example, by Hobbes, who confounded *Thought* and *Feeling* on the one hand, and *Desire* and *Will* on the other. Such a Psychology as that of Hobbes could not arise in the present state of mental science. Its absurdity would be too palpable. And the same may be said of his ethical system. Professor Haven has aimed in the work before us, simply to produce a treatise on *Psychology*, adapted to the use of classes in College. The higher problems of metaphysics do not fall within his design. But as a text-book in Psychology, we know no work which we would prefer to it. There is in it that proportion in the discussion of topics; that clearness in the statement of theories, and that life and movement in thought and style, which cannot fail to render it a very useful and attractive manual. The *rational* element in our intellectual constitution is allowed its due importance and development. *Æsthetics* find their proper place and add a new grace to a treatise of this kind. The subject most likely to excite controversy is that of the Will, and though it is handled with skill and evident fairness, we should not find ourselves able to agree with all the author's statements. A valuable feature of the work is the historical sketch of each doctrine which follows its exposition, showing what views respecting it have been held by the most eminent Philosophers in different ages. Of course such sketches must be meagre, but they are both instructive and suggestive, and may serve to stimulate a spirit of large inquiry in original sources of information.

NASHOTAH MISSION, 1858. Catalogue and Annual Letter.

Trustees of Nashotah House:—Rt. Rev. Jackson Kemper, D. D., President; Rt. Rev. George Upfold, D. D.; Rev. Wm. Shelton, D. D.; Rev. Benjamin Akerly; Rev. David Keene, B. D.; Rev. A. D. Cole, D. D., and Rev. R. H. Clarkson, D. D.

Faculty of Nashotah House:—Rev. Azel D. Cole, D. D., President and Professor of Pastoral Theology. Rev. William Adams, D. D., President of Systematic Theology. Rev. Lewis A. Kemper, A. M., B. D., Tutor of Exegesis, Greek, Latin, and Hebrew. Rev. James De Koven, A. M., Tutor in Ecclesiastical History. Rev. Sebastian B. Hodges, A. M., Tutor in Biblical History, Elocution and Music. Rev. Wm. D. Christian, Tutor in Greek.

There are now in this Institution, forty-one Students, eighteen of whom are candidates for Holy Orders, and twenty-three young men preparing to become candidates. Of the candidates, nine are expecting to graduate on Trinity Sunday. In the last eight years the number of students has trebled, and the Alumni increased from twelve to thirty-six. Of the latter nearly all are either Rectors of Churches or Missionaries of the Church in the Northwest. During all this time, this enterprise of faith has depended upon no endowments or investments, but has been carried on from week to week, and from month to month, solely by the alms and offerings of the Church received through the daily mail.

THESAURUS OF ENGLISH WORDS AND PHRASES: So Classified and Arranged as to Facilitate the Expression of Ideas, and Assist in Literary Composition. By PETER MARK ROGET, late Secretary of the Royal Society, and author of the "Bridgewater Treatise," etc. Revised and Enlarged; with a LIST OF FOREIGN WORDS AND EXPRESSIONS most frequently occurring in works of general Literature, Defined in English, by BARNAS SEARS, D. D., Secretary of the Massachusetts Board of Education, assisted by several Literary Gentlemen. New American, from the third stereotyped London edition, with additions and improvements. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1857. 12mo. pp. 510.

It may be objected to this book that it is like a rhyming Dictionary, and that its only use will be in giving words to him who lacks wit, and so in ministering aid to stupidity and dullness. The work, doubtless, may be so abused. But this will be an abuse, and a gross abuse, of a work of extraordinary value, and yet altogether unique. Years ago, we heard a distinguished Rhetorician complain of the want of just such a work as this. It is a classified list of English words and phrases, arranged not alphabetically, but according to their signification. The system of classification, or plan of arrangement, is also natural and philosophical. It commences with words, or terms, which express abstract relations; then follow those which relate to the phenomena of the material world; and then, succeed those in which mental operations are concerned. There are also further and minuter divisions and subdivisions; and a most copious and alphabetical Index to the whole furnishes every facility for reference. But this is not the only peculiarity of the work. Side by side with these classified lists of words, and in parallel columns, are corresponding lists of words, which express the exact opposites of meaning; furnishing every aid for that antithesis which gives point, force, and brilliancy to our most popular writers and speakers. We have heard it said of Daniel Webster, that he has sometimes hunted for hours for the very word that he wanted; a word, on which the whole subject of debate really hinged, and which word should be in itself, not only an argument, but a self-evident demonstration. There is another portion or department of this work, omitted in the former American edition, which, in the present, is restored. It consists of a collection of words and phrases, under each list, which, though not strictly classical, nor always elegant, sometimes even vulgar, have yet an acknowledged currency. They are such words as those with which Johnson used to extinguish Boswell when he could not silence him with arguments. "I can give you arguments," said he, on one occasion, "but I cannot give you brains." These are given in an Appendix. Having long desired, ourselves, just such a "Thesaurus" as this, we commend it to public speakers, to writers, and especially to students; to all, who aim at definite ideas, and at language in which to express them. Whether

language be regarded as the mere medium of thought, or as the instrument of its development, the study of language is of the first importance to him who pretends to have any thoughts in him or about him. The work has evidently been prepared with great care, and its repeated publication in England shows that it has met a real want. We presume it will have a large circulation in our own country.

THE SPANISH CONQUEST IN AMERICA, and its relation to the History of Slavery and to the Government of Colonies. By ARTHUR HELPS. Vol. III. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1857. 12mo. pp. 532. New Haven: E. Downes.

In the present volume, the Author, having traced the conquests and character of Cortez, gives the details of the discovery and conquest of Nicaragua, the establishment of the *encomienda* system, a system of Indian slavery; the discovery and conquest of Nicaragua; and the story of that wonderful man, Pizarro, and his conquest of Peru. And so, while the leaders of these warlike expeditions pass before us, as Cortez, and Alvarado, and Vasco Nunez, and Pizarro, the author does ample justice also to those heralds of the Cross, Las Casas and Betanzos, who sought for trophies of the Church, as they followed in the footsteps of those military conquerors. The narrative has all the charm of romance. The reader is perpetually pausing in wonder over the advanced state of civilization, found already existing in those countries; and his feelings of sadness over the melancholy fate of the Incas, is mingled with indignation at the cruelties of these Christian invaders and oppressors. Mr. Helps apologizes for his disagreement with modern historians on several points, and by saying, "that with the exception of the historical fragment of MUNOZ, and the biographies of QUINTANA, he has not read thirty pages of all that has been written by modern writers on the subject of the Spanish Conquest." This is no recommendation. Had he read attentively the explorations of modern travelers, who certainly have not lacked intelligence or candor, he would have placed less reliance on the fabulous stories of the early Spanish historians; who, at that age, had an end to accomplish at home, which a simple statement of the truth might not gain.

EUROPEAN ACQUAINTANCE: Being Sketches of People in Europe. By J. W. DE FOREST, Author of "Oriental Acquaintance." New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 12mo. pp. 276. New Haven: E. Downes.

These sketches of "European Acquaintance," are decidedly clever. There is in the author that kind of culture which extensive travel alone can give, and a naturalness and easy grace of style, a keen sense of the ridiculous, and a mingling of mirth and wit, which make him a capital story-teller. His descriptions of the invalid aristocracy, and invalid plebeianism which one meets at the hydro-pathic establishments at Graefenberg and Divonne, are full of life and zest. His chapters on Paris, and Florence, and Rome, are also very well done. The Author's comparison of the unpretending manner of the European nobility with the haughtiness and affectation of superiority on the part of the *bourgeoisie*, is one of the best things in the book. On the whole, if the reader wishes for a hearty laugh, he will hardly be disappointed in this amusing volume.

LUCY HOWARD'S JOURNAL. By MRS. L. H. SIGOURNEY. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 12mo. pp. 343. New Haven: E. Downes.

Mrs. Sigourney's motto for this volume is a saying of Webster's, "We want a history of firesides." Undoubtedly we do. We need to see the virtues of private life, sanctified in the estimation of the people. Here is the great want of American Society. "Lucy Howard's Journal" is fragmentary. Indeed, its attractiveness would have been greatly enhanced had there been interwoven into it more of the thread of personal narrative. And yet, as "Lucy Howard" is evidently only a *nom de plume*, we have no right to complain. The "Journal" is full of sentiment, always excellent, often timely. Here is one illustration: "I believe home-happiness to be the secret of national prosperity. * * * * Herein is the patriotism of woman and her privilege. Not to wrestle at the ballot-box; not to shout in popular assemblies; not to steer the ship through the blackening temp-

est, nor sound the trumpet for the battle-field, but to cheer and charm at board and hearth-stone; to teach the sanctities of deathless affection; to breathe heaven's melodies over the cradle-sleeper; to fashion by holy example every soul under her roof for a realm of harmony and peace."

And here is a sketch of touching tenderness and exquisite beauty:

"Poor little Willie! Poor little Willie! Can the last scene ever fade from my heart? When light at noonday began to forsake his eyes, he said, in loud, clear tones:

'Orra, Amy, bring a candle.'

Supposing himself going to his nightly rest, he began his accustomed prayer—

'Our Father, who art —;' but breath failed him.

Recovering himself after a while, he murmured,

'Good-night, mamma.'

Then there was a struggle and convulsion. Life kept strong hold of the beautiful clay. He gasped, with sorrow on his sweet brow,

'Don't cry, dear papa.'

His lips turned ashy pale. We thought them sealed forever; but from the deep slumber he opened widely once more those large blue eyes, whispering his cradle epithet,

'Come, greatie-papa!'

An ineffable brightness passed over his face, a blessed smile rested there, and the babe of two summers was at rest with God."

A COLLECTION OF ARTICLES ON FREE CHURCHES: By the Rector of a Free Church. New York: D. Dana. 1857. 12mo. pp. 140.

We have here two Articles from the *Church Review*, of Oct. 1855, and July, 1856; an Article by the Bishop of Fredericton, on "The Advantages of Open Seats," clear, vigorous, and well-reasoned; a bold assault on the "Pew System," by the Rev. Edward Stuart of London; and lastly, "Parish Statistics," and an Annual Address, by the Rev. E. A. Hoffman, Rector of Christ Church, Elizabeth City, New Jersey. Having been formerly applied to to furnish the Articles on Free Churches which appeared in the *Church Review* in pamphlet form, we are happy to refer to this Collection, as all that can be desired on that subject.

The discussion on "Pews and Free Seats" in the *Church Review*, conducted with ability on both sides, has done great good; it has developed principles which lie far beneath the surface of the question; and it has, we know, led to the vigorous prosecution of more than one "Free Church" effort. It has led to still greater results, we believe, in stimulating enquiry as to the best modes of diffusing the Gospel in the Church and by the Church. Doubtless there is still a considerable amount of self-complacent quiescence, easy-cushioned and fat-salaried, which has not been much disturbed by the discussion.

DEBIT AND CREDIT. Translated from the German of GUSTAV FREYTAG, by "L. C. C." With a Preface by CHRISTIAN C. J. BUNSEN, D. D., D. C. L., &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 12mo. pp. 564. New Haven: E. Downes.

It is only now and then that we bring one of the many Novels thrown in our way to the notice of our readers. This species of literature, however, has been made use of, in our times, for a specific end; to wit: to inaugurate a new Social Reform, to set forth the dignity of labor, and the duties of property, as well as to inculcate some of the most pernicious heresies of the age. Indeed, "Social Reform" is the key-note of nearly all the more respectable novels of the last twenty-five years, and the popular Novel has become the favorite weapon of modern infidelity. "Debit and Credit," while it belongs to this same class of works, yet illustrates, is based upon, and is written to affect, certain peculiar social relations and conditions in the author's own country, to which Englishmen and Americans are strangers. For the distinction between feudalism and vassalage lingered in Prussia as late as 1807, and until the new Constitution of Frederick William III, which was designed to terminate the conflict. And yet, in the ranks of the vassals

so called, was to be found much of the learning, refinement, and wealth of the nation. Unhappily, however, the development of political freedom did not keep pace with the prosperity and social culture of the people; and hence the abolishment of *caste*, and the fusion of the commercial and educated with the aristocratic classes, so common in England, is not manifest in German Society. And here we have the key to this Novel. Chevalier Bunsen vouches for the historical truthfulness of the story to history, and also for the faithfulness of the English translation. The story opens in an unpretending manner, but soon expands with the "unexpected introduction of threatening complications and even of important political events. Though confined within a seemingly narrow circle, every incident, and especially the Polish struggle, is depicted grandly, and to the life. In all this the author proves himself to be a perfect artist and a true poet, not only in the treatment of separate events, but in the far more rare and higher art of leading his conception to a satisfactory development and *denouement*."

The Novel has attained great popularity in Germany; and it will be read, aside from its own merits as an artistic production, for its clever delineation of German social life. It will doubtless help to break down social barriers, and to determine the question, what constitutes true nobility of character?

The author, Gustavus Freytag, is a Silesian by birth, of ripe age, an experienced journalist, an accomplished philologist, and of considerable reputation as a dramatic author. As a mere Reformer, we have about equal confidence in the author, and in his sponsor, Chevalier Bunsen.

BISHOP LEE'S THANKSGIVING SERMON, in St. Luke's Church, Davenport, Iowa. Nov. 26, 1857. "The True Elements of Civil Prosperity." 8vo, pp. 22.

The tone of Bishop Lee's Sermon is conciliatory, yet mingled with firmness, as the following passages show:

"The conservative character of our Church, its solemn and appropriate forms of devotion, its system of religious training, its primitive order, and its venerable history, all combine to commend it to the taste, the judgment, and the conscience; and there are not a few amongst us who feel the strength of its claims, who are not as yet connected with its communion, or its congregations.

"We are happy to recognize among other bodies of Christians the leading truths and doctrines which we hold as 'the faith once delivered to the saints,' though we believe them to have departed from the primitive order of the Church.

"We can make no compromises as to our doctrinal or our ecclesiastical system; but we can and will rejoice in any holy influence that may be exerted, though large contributions thereto be made by those who follow not with us."

In these and other kind words which he utters, the Bishop distinguishes between individual Christians, and the systems to which they are attached. As for these systems, unscriptural and unprimitive, and already splitting into fragments, and showing signs of premature decay, the Bishop has never endorsed them, and we venture to say he never will. That Bishop Lee has faith enough in what he professes to believe is the Church of Christ to labor, heart and soul, for her welfare, we do not doubt. For, be a man's Creed or System what it may, he will never gain converts to it, if he has not faith in it himself to make him thoroughly in earnest in its behalf; or if his object *seems* to be, to make others believe that they do not differ much from him after all.

THE BIBLE IN THE WORKSHOP, or Christianity the Friend of Labor. By Rev. JOHN W. MEARS. New York: C. Scribner. 1857. 8vo. pp. 344.

This volume presents a familiar and practical view of the friendly relations of Christianity to labor, what religion has done for the workingman, and may still accomplish for his welfare.

When we consider that the elevation of the working classes in comfort and intelligence, is not attended with a proportionate religious elevation, and that a large class of foreign workmen come to our shores imbued with bitter prejudices against Christianity, we cannot value too highly arguments

which tend not only to diffuse through the community, sentiments of respect for labor, but also to show that Christianity in its origin and progress has honorably recognized the laborer and befriended him by simplifying its great truths, and offering its great blessings alike to the learned and unlearned.

Besides giving the Scripture history of industrial pursuits, thus showing their dignity and their accordance with the Divine purpose in creation, the author has added an interesting history of the condition of the working classes from ancient times, with a view of what Christianity has done to improve their personal condition. The closing chapters are devoted to the advantages derived to the workman from the institution of the Christian Sabbath, for which modern civilization is indebted to Christianity, and which is presented in its influence upon labor in marked contrast to the festal days of heathen nations and of the Greeks and Romans. So true is it, that wherever the seventh day is religiously observed, any community becomes conscious of the importance and dignity of industrial pursuits—obedience to the command to rest upon the one day, implying a disposition to observe the command to labor on the other six.

The book will be found very readable, and cannot fail to do good to all who read it.

HON. MOSES SHERBURNE'S ADDRESS at the New England Festival, Dec. 22d, 1857, at St. Paul, Minnesota.

It makes one proud of his country to read the spirited sketch of the exercises at this Puritan Festival at St. Paul. Itself a thriving city of already some ten thousand inhabitants, and nearly two thousand miles from the mouth of the River on whose banks it sits nestled in queenly beauty, we find the old "Forefather's day" celebrated with becoming enthusiasm and dignity. Mr. Sherburne, in his Address, pays a more appropriate tribute to the character of the Puritans than we recollect ever to have seen done in New England on such an occasion. As to their "liberty of Conscience," he says: "persecution for opinion's sake never reigned more triumphantly, and human reason was never more completely hedged in by cruel and bloody laws, than during the early progress and government of our Puritan fathers." But he does ample justice to those misjudged men, and the whole affair, supper and all, passed off with *ecbat*.

THE WEEKLY EUCHARIST; The "Old Path, and "Good Way" of the Church.

By the REV. E. A. HOFFMAN, M. A., Rector of Christ Church, Elizabeth, New Jersey. New York: D. Dana, Jr. 1857. 18mo. pp. 50.

The restoration of the "Weekly Eucharist," will follow, almost inevitably, upon the restoration of Daily Prayers; and we see indications of the return to this latter practice multiplying everywhere around us. We observed recently in a New York denominational paper a notice of a new book *urging Daily Public Prayers from Primitive precedent!* In the Primitive Church, Christians communicated not only weekly but daily. At the Reformation, the first Prayer Book of Edward VI, recognized the administration of the Holy Communion on every Lord's Day, and every holy-day. We need not speak of the infrequency which has since obtained in the English and Scotch Churches, and our own; growing out of the low state of piety, and defective and erroneous views of the nature of the Sacrament. The Church will have learned a great deal, when she has learned to appropriate all that really belongs to the genius of our Holy Religion, uninfluenced either by a superstitious dread, or affectation, of mediæval novelties and corruptions. With these remarks, we commend to the attention of our readers the well-written pamphlet of Mr. Hoffman.

THOUGHTS FOR THE HOLY WEEK, FOR YOUNG PERSONS. By Miss SEWELL. New York: Stanford & Delisser. 1858. 16mo. New Haven: S. Babcock.

Aside from the beauty of the style and the freshness and tenderness of the Christian feeling of this little volume, a special characteristic is the distinctness with which each prominent event of our Saviour's life during the Holy Week, is portrayed.

THE WORKS OF TACITUS. The Oxford Translation Revised. In two volumes. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 12mo. pp. 464, 496. New Haven: E. Downes.

The principal works of Tacitus were (1) his "History," which comprised Roman affairs from the death of Nero, A. D. 68, to the death of Domitian, A. D. 96; (2) his "Annals," which reach from the death of Augustus, A. D. 14, to the death of Nero; both of which exist only in very imperfect state; (3) his "Life of Agricola," his father-in-law; (4) his treatise "On the Manners and Customs of the Germans;" (5) his "Dialogue on Orators." He has been regarded as almost a model of a historian, and his works were a main reliance of Gibbon, as they have been of later writers, for the period of which he wrote. His works in their English dress, will be widely read; and the present Oxford edition is rendered still more valuable by its learned and copious notes.

THE ENGLISH LANGUAGE IN ITS ELEMENTS AND FORMS; with a history of its origin and development. Abridged from the Octavo Edition. Designed for the use of Schools and families. By WILLIAM C. FOWLER, late Professor of Rhetoric in Amherst College. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1858. 12mo. pp. 381. New Haven: E. Downes.

On the appearance of the octavo edition of Prof. Fowler's Grammar in 1850, we gave a full sketch of the plan of the work, and our opinion of its merits. This abridgement is characterized by the same thoroughly analytical element; it embraces all the essentials of the larger work; and we are glad to see that in several sections the author has made large use of Dr. Gibbs' philological tables and labors. It is, on the whole, the most thoroughly scientific Grammar that we have in our language.

MAMMA'S LESSONS ABOUT JESUS. By a MOTHER. New York: Stanford & Delisser. 1858. 16mo. pp. 200. New Haven: S. Babcock.

These Lessons are well adapted to interest children in the life, and character, and works, of the meek and lowly JESUS, and so, to do good. The theology of the volume is sometimes loosely stated, but the general effect of the work will be of the right kind, notwithstanding.

MELODIES FOR CHILDHOOD. New York: T. N. Stanford. 1857. 12mo. pp. 266. New Haven: S. Babcock.

The compiler has been successful in gathering a choice collection of Nursery Songs, old and new, religious and moral, full of nature and full of devotion. The names of the authors are not always correctly given. Prof. C. C. Moore, and not Howard, wrote the "Christmas Times," on p. 184.

FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT AND PASTORAL LETTER TO THE PARISH OF TRINITY CHURCH, CLEVELAND, OHIO. By the Rector. Cleveland, 1858. 8vo. pp. 20.

We believe that it was settled by the Correspondence of the Rev. Dr. Bolles with his Bishop, that the Doctor is not a Papist in disguise. We wish it was equally apparent to the Church, what a work he is doing, and how he is doing it. The following passage from his Pastoral Letter, has the true trumpet tone. "I hesitate not to lift up my voice for a new reformation—not a reformation for the settlement of fundamental principles; for in our Church those principles have already been settled in the everlasting Creeds of all Christendom, in all time—but a reformation which shall swallow up and devour the parties now existing, and which shall bring out the *every day working and practical system* of the Church; a reformation, not in the doctrines of CHRIST, but in the LIFE OF CHRIST, and which shall enable us to say to all men, as our SAVIOUR said to the disciples of John,—'Go and tell John,' &c. God be praised, I see the signs of such a glorious reformation in the Church, and I would rather lay my head upon the block than to stand in its way." Dr. Bolles has described the efforts of our parochial clergy in bringing forth "elaborate discourses," "rich and polished periods," and "magniloquent addresses," in words that fairly scorch with truthful meaning.

"Trinity Church Home for the Sick and Friendless," is starting well in connection with this working and noble parish. There is such a reformation, going on in the Church, beyond a peradventure. Let us thank God and take courage.

PAPERS ON THE UNPOPULARITY OF RELIGIOUS TRUTH. By the Rev. W. STEWART DARLING, Assistant Minister of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Toronto. 1857. 12mo. pp. 85.

Mr. Darling's papers, which were formerly published in a Toronto Church Newspaper, show, by a historical retrospect, how strong the tendency has been in all ages to take and to maintain partial, one-sided, and defective views of religious truth; and how these views uniformly develop sooner or later their own inherent weakness, either by a process of corruption or decay. In later times Puritanism, Wesleyanism, Evangelicalism, Anglo-Catholicism, and Romanizing Tendencies, are selected as illustrations. It is the discoloration of truth by the admixture of error, that has given it so strong a hold upon the disordered jaundiced vision of religious zealots in every age. It is a thoughtful pamphlet.

SWORD'S POCKET ALMANAC. 1858.

Besides a list of the Clergy, and the Statistics of each Diocese as usual, this *vade mecum* for the present year contains also an alphabetical list of the Clergy, with their Post Office address; and also a List of the Archbishops and Bishops of the Church in England, Ireland, Scotland and the Colonies; together with the number of Clergy, Benefices, and Glebe Houses or Parsonages in each jurisdiction; prepared by a Dignitary of the Church, expressly for this Almanac.

From this list we gather the following summary: Number of Archbishops, 4; Bishops, England, 26; Ireland, 10; Scotland, 7; Colonies, 32; retired Bishops, 4; total, 83.

Clergy—in England, 15,991; Ireland, 2,336; Scotland, 175; the Colonies, 1,437; total number of Archbishops, Bishops, and Clergy, 20,022.

THE FIFTH ANNUAL CATALOGUE AND REGISTER OF RACINE COLLEGE, Wisconsin. 1857.

The whole number of Students in this College, is 51. The Institution is gaining in numbers; a new College building is in process of erection; it has one of the most beautiful sites in all the West; and its learned and indefatigable President is sustained by an efficient corps of Professors. It is growing in power and influence.

CATALOGUE OF THE GENERAL THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY, for 1857-8.

There are now 36 Students in the Seminary, viz: Seniors, 11; Middle Class, 9; Juniors, 16. The whole number of Alumni is 493; of whom, there are deceased, 61.

TWENTY FOURTH ANNUAL REPORT of the Bishop White Prayer Book Society, Philadelphia.

As a paper on the Liturgical movement of our country, this Report deserves a wide circulation. It is able and timely.

FIFTH ANNUAL REPORT AND DISCOURSE of the Rector of Trinity Church, Pottsville, Pa.

This gratifying Report gives evidence of an enterprising and vigorous parish.

BISHOP MEADE'S PASTORAL LETTER, on Schools and Teachers. 1858. 8vo. pp. 40.

BISHOP DOANE'S ADVENT SERMON, for the Times. In St. Mary's Church, Burlington. 1857. 8vo. pp. 8.

REV. S. C. THRALL'S THANKSGIVING SERMON, in Trinity Church, San Francisco, Cal., Nov. 26, 1857. 8vo. pp. 12.

REV. L. R. STAUDENMAYER'S SERMON, on the Loss of the Central America, in the Church of the Annunciation, New York City, Oct. 4, 1857. 8vo. pp. 26.

REV. SAMUEL BUEL'S SERMON, at the Burial of Walter Hughson, M. D., in Christ Church, Poughkeepsie, N. Y., Dec. 13, 1857. 8vo. pp. 18.

ECCLESIASTICAL REGISTER.

SUMMARY OF HOME INTELLIGENCE.

ORDINATIONS.

DEACONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Charlot N. P.	Polk,	Jan. 3, '58,	Mt. Olivet Church, Algiers, La.
Christian, William,	Whittingham,	Feb. 28, '58,	Grace, Baltimore, Md.
Cornell, Thomas F.	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, '57,	St. Luke's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Henderson, J. Martin,	Doane,	Feb. 28, '58,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Langdon, William C.	Whittingham,	Feb. 28, '58,	Grace, Baltimore, Md.
Marsh, Henry,	Potter, H.	Sept. 29, '57,	Intercession, Carmansville, N. Y.
Morrison, G. F.	Whittingham,	Dec. 20, '57,	St. John's, Washington, D. C.
Perryman, Edward G.	Whittingham,	Feb. 28, '58,	Grace, Baltimore, Md.
Pyne, Henry,	Whittingham,	Dec. 20, '57,	St. John's, Washington, D. C.
Scott, Uriah,	Potter, A.	Jan. 10, '58,	Church of the Mediator, Phil., Pa.
Stansbury, John N.	Doane,	Feb. 28, '58,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
Taylor, George B.	Kip,	Jan. 10, '58,	Grace, San Francisco, Cal.
Thomson, James,	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, '57,	St. Luke's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Tripp Ferris,	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, '57,	St. Luke's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Welles, Edward R.	DeLancey,	Dec. 20, '57,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.
Whiting, Nathan F.	Potter, H.	March 3, '58,	St. Mark's, Williamsburgh, N. Y.
Willing, Matthias E.	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, '57,	St. Luke's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
Wingfield, J. H. D.	Freeman,	Jan. 17, '58,	Christ, Little Rock, Ark.
Winslow, Jedediah,	DeLancey,	Dec. 20, '57,	Trinity, Geneva, W. N. Y.

PRIESTS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Rev. Banwell, Henry,	McCaskry,	Dec. 8, '57,	St. Stephen's, Hamburg, Mich.
" Barrows, Joshua Law,	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, '57,	St. Luke's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
" Carver, Thomas G.	Williams,	Feb. 24, '58,	St. Michael's, Naugatuck, Ct.
" Chase, Edwin B.	Doane,	Dec. 20, '57,	St. Mary's, Burlington, N. J.
" Dalrymple, S. B.	Potter, A.	Nov. 28, '57,	St. Paul's, Lock Haven, Pa.
" Drumm, Thomas,	Potter, A.	Dec. 6, '57,	Trinity, Carbondale, Pa.
" Denniston, Edward,	Cobbs,	Jan. 28, '58,	St. John's, Montgomery, Ala.
" Dean, George W.	Potter, H.	Feb. 24, '58,	Trinity, New York City.
" Ewer, F. C.	Kip,	Jan. 17, '58,	Grace, San Francisco, Cal.
" Ely, William,	Potter, A.	Feb. 7, '58,	Christ, New Brighton, Pa.
" Peck, Wm. L.	Potter, H.	Feb. 21, '58,	St. George, (Beekman-st.) N.Y.
" Phillips, H. L.	Davis,	Dec. 2, '57,	Grace, Charleston, S. C.
" Points, J. T.	Johns,	Mich. 3, '58,	Chap. Theo. Sem. Alex'ia, Va.
" Smith, Francis W.	Potter, H.	Dec. 20, '57,	St. Luke's, Brooklyn, N. Y.
" Stryker, Augustus P.	Whittingham,	Feb. 28, '58,	Grace, Baltimore, Md.

CONSECRATIONS.

<i>Name.</i>	<i>Bishop.</i>	<i>Time.</i>	<i>Place.</i>
Christ,	Lee, A.	Dec. 13, '57,	Delaware City, Del.
Christ,	Davis,	Jan. 5, '58,	Charleston, S. C.
Church of the Redeemer,	Potter, A.	Feb. 1, '58,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Grace,	Kemper,	Feb. 14, '58,	Madison, Wis.
St. Luke's,	Kemper,	Oct. 8, '57,	Hastings, Minnesota Territory.
St. Mary's,	Hopkins,	Dec. 26, '53,	Northfield, Vt.

OBITUARY.

The Rev. HARRY CROSWELL, D. D., Rector of Trinity Church, in New Haven, Conn., departed this life at 10 o'clock A. M., March 13th, at the ripe old age of 79 years, 8 months and 27 days.

He was born at West Hartford, Connecticut, June 16th, 1778. He was baptized in St. Peter's Church, Albany, N. Y., July 19, 1812; and on the following Sunday received the rite of confirmation. He was admitted to Deacon's Orders by the Rt. Rev. BISHOP HOBART, May 8, 1814, in St. John's Church, New York city; and on the following Sunday commenced ministerial labors in Christ Church, Hudson, N. Y. On the 1st of January, 1815, he commenced his services in this city, in an old wooden building standing in Church street; and was instituted into the Rectorship of the Parish on the opening of the new Trinity Church, Feb. 22, 1816. He was admitted to Priest's Orders in Christ Church, Middletown, June 6, 1815, by the Rt. Rev. BISHOP GRISWOLD. The honorary degree of A. M. was conferred upon him by Yale College, in 1817; and of D. D., by Trinity College, in 1831. At the close of the *forty-first* year of his Ministry in New Haven, Jan. 1, 1856, he had officiated personally at 2,553 Baptisms, at 837 Marriages, and at 1842 Burials.

Dr. Crowell was sustained, in his last hours, by a firm and confiding faith, and died like a Christian veteran whose work is done and well done.

A sketch of his life and character may be expected hereafter in the Review.

DIED, at Grafton, Lorain Co., O., Dec. 4, 1857, the Rev. ABRAHAM WHEELER, in the 79th year of his age. The deceased was for some years engaged in preaching the Gospel as a Minister of the Congregational Church, but about the year 1839, his views on the Polity of the Church having, after studious research, undergone a change, he applied to the present Bishop of the Diocese of Ohio for Ordination. He was duly admitted to the Order of Deacons in the year last mentioned, and shortly after fully ordained Presbyterian of the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which he labored till the year 1852, when his constitution being impaired, he was placed upon the list of the superannuated Clergy of the Diocese.

His end, sudden at the last, was marked by much patient endurance, and his consolation was the contemplation of that crown of righteousness which his Redeemer has freely bestowed on him.

"He rests from his labors and his works do follow him."

DIED, at Camden, Arkansas, October 29th, 1857, the Rev. STEPHEN McHUGH.

In the death of Mr. McHugh, the Church loses one of her oldest and most faithful Missionaries. Stationed for many years at one of our most distant Missions in the Southwest, where it is said he was for five long years without seeing the face of a brother clergyman of the Church, and for two years without a visit from his Missionary Bishop, he yet labored long and faithfully, in prayer and faith. Though he now rests from his labors, his works will follow him.

The Domestic Committee on hearing of his death, placed the following minute upon their records:

"The Domestic Committee have heard with deep regret of the death of their long tried and faithful Missionary, Rev. Stephen McHugh of Camden, Arkansas, and would express their sincere sympathy with his bereaved family, and his sorrowing flock; cherishing with them a lively and grateful remembrance of his valuable services, his sincere devotion to his work, and his fidelity and patience under his isolation, privations, and discouragements. They also direct his missionary stipend to be paid to the family of Mr. McHugh, until the first of January, 1858."

DIED, at Phoenixville, Pa., February 6, 1858, the Rev. THOMAS W. WINCHESTER, Rector of St. Peter's Church, Great Valley, and St. Peter's Church, Phoenixville, Chester County.

DIED, at Columbus, Texas, on the 11th of December, 1857, the Rev. HANNIBAL PRATT, a Missionary of the Domestic Board, aged 30 years.

Mr. Pratt was a native of Tinnmouth, Vermont, where he spent the first seventeen years of his life. In 1844, he removed to Matagorda, Texas, remaining till September, 1848, when he entered the Freshman class of Trinity College, Hartford, Conn.

His standing there, both as a student and as a man, was high. At the beginning of his senior year, 1851, he was compelled by ill health to lay down his books, and return to Texas. He was ordained Deacon by Bishop Freeman, in 1854, at St. Paul's College, of which he was one year Rector, and Priest in the following year. A College friend pays this feeling tribute to his worth and memory:

"He was one of those rare men who are more likely to do a kind and noble action in circumstances where the world can never hear it. His heart and purse were both open, too open for his own interest. His disease was hastened by overwork and care. He insisted that his mother and sisters should be with him if they desired it, nobly sacrificing his own advancement to their comfort. He told his friends, on his death-bed, he had no care left but for them; 'he had long been accustomed to *rest* in the Gospel which he preached, and it did not fail him in the hour of his need.' Verily, his days *shall* be long in the land which his Lord hath given him! and if God buries His workmen, He thus carries on their work."

DEATH OF MRS. PAYNE.

Mrs. ANNA M. PAYNE, wife of the Rt. Rev. BISHOP PAYNE of the African Mission, died at Cavalla, Dec. 4th, 1857. For several years consumption has been preying upon her, but she continued as long as possible laboring in Christ's work which she so much loved. Her death was peaceful and her departure called forth great sympathy from the Christian colonists and natives. The Rev. Mr. Hoffman gives the following account of the funeral, which took place on Saturday, Dec. 5th.

"Six native Christians carried the bier to the Church of the Epiphany, while the bell tolled solemnly. The procession was in the following order:

"1. The clergy present—Rev. Messrs. Hoffman, Gibson, and Jones. 2. The body; four pall bearers. 3. The Bishop and family, and friends from Cape. 4. The old men from the native towns. 5. The Mission scholars. 6. The native Christians and villagers. 7. The native women. 8. The native men.

"The Church was crowded to overflowing. On entering, I repeated the Sentences; then, the first three verses of 196 Hymn ('O where shall rest be found') were sung. Rev. Mr. Gibson proceeded with the service to the end of the Lesson. An address was then delivered from Heb. iv, 9: 'There remaineth, therefore, a rest to the people of God.' This was interpreted to the natives by the Rev. Mr. Jones, who himself followed in a short address, in Grebo. Two verses of the hymn, 'Hark! from the tombs,' were sung, in Grebo, when, in the same order that we entered, we left the Church, and walked, with the solemn tolling of the bell, to the garden graveyard.

"Here I read the remainder of the service, and the ground closed on *one* whose labors on earth had peacefully closed, and whose eternal rest had commenced in Heaven. Great sympathy was showed to the Bishop by the natives. A proclamation was made the evening before the funeral, that no one should leave the town. Their work was suspended, that they might honor the dead. For some days after, persons were coming from the surrounding tribes, visiting the Bishop, in token of their sympathy.

"Those immediately around sent him a bullock, as a present, which is the custom among themselves. In every way they honored the dead, and showed their sorrow for the living."

MISCELLANEOUS.

CALIFORNIA.—On the 21st of Dec. the Rt. Rev. Bishop KIR resigned the Rectorship of Grace Church, San Francisco, which he had held four years, that he may devote his attention to the Church throughout the Diocese.

WESTERN NEW YORK.—HOBART FREE COLLEGE.—The Rev. Dr. Hale, who for more than twenty years has presided over this College, has been compelled, from impaired health, to resign a position which he has filled with much credit to himself, and benefit to the Institution.

CONNECTICUT—TRINITY COLLEGE.

The absolute necessity of rendering the educational Institutions of the Church vastly more effective, we shall not now attempt to prove. But one thing is certain. They must do more, or they will do less. TRINITY COLLEGE at Hartford, we have sometimes thought was almost too modest in not challenging more boldly public sympathy and coöperation. Recent events, and especially the determination of some able men, and Prof. Eliot among others, to identify themselves with its interests, have furnished a new claim to public confidence, which we are happy to find responded to in a considerable accession of students as well as making the Institution better known throughout the Church. We find, in a late *Calendar*, the following statement, which we commend to our readers:

"The development of the College, in a religious point of view, has been peculiarly marked during the past year. The repairs of the Chapel, so far from being the first step, are rather the last; at any rate, the last as yet taken. The first was the organization of a department of Religious Instruction, into which were brought various studies, hitherto scattered through different departments, as well as other studies now introduced. A glance at the College Calendar will show what the department is, and what it embraces; addresses in the Chapel, lectures and recitations in the instruction rooms, covering points of the highest importance to the students as Christian scholars. There then followed the extension of the Chapel services, including the administration of the Holy Communion, the observance of the Feasts and Fasts of the Church by appropriate rites, and the restoration of forms of prayer previously omitted from the Daily Service. Not until all this was accomplished, not until the life that was within was stirred, did the Chapel itself, its aspect and its external influences, receive attention. It could have been wished, devoutly wished, that the funds of the College, or the impulses of some Christian benefactor, had authorized the erection of a proper Chapel, one that would stand with uplifted spire, the guardian spirit of the College precincts. But as there was no immediate prospects of a Chapel building, the next best thing was planned, and the repairs of the Chapel-room, as it is, were begun upon. To this end, an offertory was taken at every celebration of the Holy Communion, while individual offerings were received and employed; officers and students engaging together in the good work, and one or two friends from without assisting. What has been the result, can be seen at the Chapel. The chancel, or rather sacrum, is in order; an altar stands beneath a window bearing the symbol of the Holy Trinity; a lecturn is in the foreground; and the chairs and other furniture wear a seemly and a solemn look. A Communion Service presented by a mother and her two daughters before the repairs were commenced, is in keeping with the spirit and aspect of the whole.

"If now, it be asked, of what effect is all this—how does it bear upon the students, or how do they interest themselves in it, the answer may be made most cheerfully. Not only is the deportment of the young men in the Chapel greatly improved, not only is their feeling towards the services raised and purified, but a holy spell seems to have been thrown over all their academic relations; they are better friends with their instructors, better sons of their Alma Mater; more interested in their work and in hers, than they have ever been. We do not mean that this is universal, or that there are no exceptions, or striking ones; but we mean every word that we utter, when we say that the development of the religious element in the College system has been attended by the most striking proofs of its influence and its working among the large majority of the students.

"What the College, or those of its members, most deeply committed to the work thus begun, now ask for, is, in the first place, sympathy, and only in the second place, pecuniary assistance. They ask the sympathy of Churchmen for

an institution which seeks to become, more and more, the handmaid of the Church. They ask the sympathy of all who believe in the possibility of religious education; who respect the laws of God and the laws of the land, and would have them respected by the rising generation; who are interested in the intellectual expansion of our College courses and the intellectual elevation of our College bodies;—from all these, the College and its friends ask for peace and good will. It is a comparatively small matter to ask for a few hundred dollars towards completing the repairs of a Chapel; but let the request be made, let it go forth that Trinity College is obliged to ask for pecuniary aid, in order to make herself more worthy of her Holy and Undivided NAME."

METHODIST REVISED RITUAL.

While the Presbyterian and German Reformed Communions are making steady advances toward a Ritual mode of worship, the Methodists seem to be waxing more and more radical, in this as in other matters, and, as we think, under various influences not of a hopeful character. It seems that,

"At the General conference, held in Indianapolis, in May, 1856, it was

"Resolved, That a committee of five be appointed by the chair to revise the rituals of our Church."

This committee have already reported, but their work has not yet been acted upon. This work, they say, consists,

"1. Of a strict purgation of the book from all traces of the Papal theory of the sacraments.

"2. Of a few changes in the service, made for the purpose of giving the congregation a larger share therein.

"3. Of the addition of forms for the laying of corner-stones and for the dedication of Churches, which forms are, it is thought, very much needed to give uniformity to these interesting services throughout our connection."

RADICAL CHANGES IN METHODISM.

We have often adverted to the vital changes apparent in the tone and spirit of the Methodists in the United States; and have said that these foreshadow corresponding alterations in the organism of that denomination. And here it comes. A Methodist Convention was held in Rochester, N. Y., Dec. 21st, when the most radical and sweeping measures were boldly brought forward and advocated. A Methodist newspaper, *The Northern Independent*, gives the following programme of these prospective alterations in that system:

"I. A new chapter on slavery, entirely prohibiting the holding of slaves.

"II. The non-ordination of Bishops, and the doing away of that part of the Ritual.

"III. The election of Bishops for only four years, instead of for life.

"IV. The election of Presiding Elders by the Annual Conferences.

"V. Such an alteration of the Districts as will greatly reduce the expense of the office of Presiding Elder, and require the labors of such an office only where it is needed.

"VI. Lay delegation in the Annual and General Conferences.

"VII. An eligibility on the part of the Preachers generally to consecutive re-appointment for more than one year."

A writer in the Methodist organ thus speaks of the declining power of the system.

"The statistics speak for themselves.

"During the first twenty years the average increase was twenty-five per cent., for the second twenty years it was only seven per cent.; for the third twenty years it was five and a half per cent.; and for the fourth twenty years five per cent.; or, for the first half of the Church's history, sixteen per cent.; and for the second half five and one-fourth per cent. I do assert that the present working of her system, with all her increased opportunities, and multiplied facilities, does effect less for God and humanity than it did formerly. If any one is in doubt on

this point let him visit the hundreds of almost deserted class-rooms ; our meagerly attended prayer meetings ; and he will soon be convinced that there is a manifest decline in devoted piety with the masses ; or that we have discovered that class-meetings and prayer-meetings are not the efficient agents for promoting godliness that our fathers believed them to be." "We have nearly a score of *struggling* Colleges, and we convert fewer sinners than when we had none. Our seminaries crown almost every hill, and enliven almost every valley, and fewer of our sons and daughters are converted to God than before. The conclusion must therefore be, either that the Church is misdirecting her moral power, or that her moral power is declining."

SUNDAY IN NEW YORK CITY.

A number of Ministers of different denominations have been holding meetings to devise measures to "arrest the progress of Sabbath desecration." They have lately issued a Report of the most startling character. The committee report 9,692 places of business and amusement engaged in their ordinary and mostly destructive traffic on Sunday, making about one place to every 65 of the entire population. Of these, there were 437 restaurants, 1,234 confectionary and sear stores, 2,416 dry goods and kindred stores, 1,977 groceries, 3,408 drinking shops. The balance were pawnbrokers' shops, policy and exchange shops, daguerrean galleries, dance-houses, concert rooms, &c.

It is, however, painful to see how their suggestions are met even by the most respectable of the newspapers of the city. The *Evening Post* says, "Indeed, it may well be doubted whether the observance of the Sabbath as a conventional formality is not prejudicial rather than beneficial to good morals, as it adds hypocrisy to the original offense ; and legislation, so far as it tends to coerce such observance, promotes hypocrisy and brings the institutions of religion into discredit."

In the same paper the notorious Lola Montez, after a stroll through "The Tombs," is reported to have said, "Abolish prisons, and crime will abolish itself. I hold that every criminal is *insane*. If he were not insane to a certain extent, he would not do wrong. I would have them all placed under the care of intelligent guardians, and have them all treated as insane persons. Why is it that men who commit murder and other horrible offenses are sent to the Asylum when they are known to be insane ? We all know that this is done, and that such persons are often restored to reason. I would treat them all in the same way. For however great the offense, men and women are not beasts, after all, and should be treated with humanity. Yes, yes," said she, with nervous energy, "every prison in the world must be pulled down."

If the *Post* is right, Lola Montez is right.

NOTE.—A large amount of Domestic Intelligence is crowded out.

SUMMARY OF FOREIGN INTELLIGENCE.

DEATH OF THE BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

The Rt. Rev. Daniel Wilson, D. D., Bishop of Calcutta, died Jan. 3d, 1858, at the age of 80 years. He was born in 1778 ; studied for College under the Rev. Josiah Pratt ; entered St. Edmund's Hall, Oxford, in 1798 ; was ordained in 1801 as curate of the Rev. Richard Cecil, at Chobham and Bisley in Surrey, soon afterwards he became Vice Principal, or Tutor of St. Edmund's Hall, and held at the same time the curacies of Upper and Nether Worton, near Banbury. From thence he removed in 1812 to be minister of St. John's Chapel, Bedford-row.

In 1824, Mr. Wilson was instituted to the family living of St. Mary's, Islington, where he remained till his appointment to his Bishopric, in March, 1832. The erection of three large churches in Islington at a time when church building was a work of far greater difficulty than at present, together with the establishment of many useful Institutions, testify to his extraordinary zeal and success as a parochial minister. He was a widower when he went to India. His only surviving children are the Rev. Daniel Wilson, Vicar of Islington, and a daughter, the wife of the Rev. Joseph Bateman, who was for some years his chaplain in India, afterwards Vicar of Huddersfield, and now of Foots Cray, Kent.

NEW BISHOP OF CALCUTTA.

Those who hoped in the appointment of Bishops for a different type of Churchmanship under the Derby Ministry, will not be pleased to know that Lord Palmerston had arranged to give a successor to Bishop Wilson. The Rev. G. E. Cotton, head master of Marlborough School, has been appointed to the Bishopric of Calcutta, vacant by the death of the late Dr. D. Wilson. Mr. Cotton was educated at Westminster School, and elected from the Foundation to Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1832. He was assistant-master at Rugby under Dr. Arnold.

Dr. Cotton is said to sustain a high character as a practical, learned, and Christian man, and his appointment is especially distasteful to the ultraists of the radical party. He belongs, however, to "Broad" School.

CONSECRATION OF THE BISHOP OF ANTIGUA.

The Rev. Dr. Rigaud, Head Master of the Grammar-school, Ipswich, was consecrated on Tuesday, Feb. 2d, in the chapel, Lambeth Palace, to the See of Antigua, by his Grace the Archbishop of Canterbury. The Bishops of Chichester, Oxford, and Jamaica officiated. The sermon was preached by the Rev. Canon Wordsworth. The Church was early planted in Antigua; and a Church edifice was erected at St. Johns, as early as 1683. But the scandalous lives and unfaithful conduct of too many of the Clergy left the work of Christ to the Methodists; whose labors in the last century were very successful. There are now about 35 Church Clergy in the Island. Sending missionaries and building churches does not always build up the Church.

MEETING OF CONVOCATION.

The Convocation of the Province of Canterbury, appointed to sit on the 3d of February, was prorogued to Wednesday, February the 10th, when it assembled for the dispatch of business.

THE HOUSE OF BISHOPS.—The members present were the Most Rev. the Archbishop of Canterbury, the Bishops of London, Winchester, Exeter, St. David's, Chichester, Oxford, Llandaff, St. Asaph, Hereford, Bath and Wells, Lincoln, and Gloucester. The Vicar-General, (Dr. Twiss,) the Registrar-General of the Province, (Mr. F. Hart Dyke,) Mr. F. Knyvett, and Mr. Watts were in attendance on the Archbishop.

The Prolocutor (the Dean of Bristol) and several other members of the Lower House having been introduced, His Grace the President intimated that a report on the subject of Church Extension at Home and Abroad having been agreed to in the last session, their lordships wished the Lower House to take the matter into consideration, and would be glad to receive their report. The Prolocutor and the other members of the Lower House then retired.

The Bishop of St. Asaph presented the following petition:—

To the Most Rev. the Archbishop, the Right Rev. the Bishops, and the Rev. Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned members of the Church of England, at present engaged in an attempt to promote the extension of Christian Missions in India,

Showeth—That in the year 1844 the late Bishop of Calcutta addressed a letter to the President of the Board of Control, representing that his diocese was at that time very much too large to be properly superintended by a single Bishop, and that its immediate subdivision was imperatively required for the good of the Church in India.

That since that time the extent of the diocese has been very greatly increased by the annexation of the Punjaub and of Oude, and by the conquest of Pegu.

That there is good reason to hope that the conversion of the natives of India to the Christian faith will in future advance much more rapidly than it has hitherto done; and it is desirable that her Majesty should be empowered by Parliament to separate off from the existing dioceses, and constitute a distinct Bishopric, any district or province of India, in which the number of native Christian Churches, or other circumstances, may make it desirable to do so.

That the present vacancy in the See of Calcutta affords a favorable opportunity for the increase of the Episcopate in that great presidency.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your two houses will be pleased to take the premises into your serious consideration, and to adopt such measures as may seem to you best calculated for the attainment of the object of your petitioners, namely, an adequate provision for the Episcopal superintendence of the existing See of Calcutta, at present vacant by the lamented death of the late venerable Bishop thereof.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

The petition, (the Right Rev. Prelate observed) was signed by Lord John Manners, Mr. Puller, Mr. Adderley, and other members of the House of Commons.

The Bishop of Lincoln presented a petition protesting against the late Divorce Act.

The same Bishop also presented the following petition, numerously signed :
To the Most Rev. the Archbishop, the Right Rev. the Bishops, and the Rev. the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned, Clergy of the Diocese of Lincoln,

Showeth—That your petitioners have reason to know that efforts are making in divers quarters for the revision of the Book of Common Prayer, with the professed view of abbreviating the ordinary services of the Church.

That they believe that the announcement made by your lordships of your willingness to allow the use of the Litany, in certain cases, as a separate service, is calculated to lead to such abbreviation as may sometimes be desirable.

That they feel the value of the suggestions offered in the report of the Committee of Convocation on Church Services, in the session of 1854, for occasional services, such as Thanksgiving Offices, Penitential Offices, Offices for Children, and others, to be used with the permission of the Bishop of the Diocese.

That whilst they deprecate most strongly any fusion of the three Offices of our usual morning service into one, by the omission of portions of each or any of them, they would rejoice that every facility should be afforded for the use of all these services separately when desirable.

But, considering the many difficulties and hazards which beset the question, your petitioners earnestly pray your venerable body strenuously to oppose any attempt at legislative interference with, or alteration of, the Book of Common Prayer itself.

And your petitioners will ever pray, &c.

This Petition called forth a full expression of opinion. All parties agreed in opposition to any, and every plan, for a revision or alteration of the Prayer Book. The Bishop of Oxford, and the Bishop of Hereford, were equally positive on this point.

The House of Bishops then took up the Report, presented at last Convocation, of the Committee appointed to "consider and report on the most desirable modes of making fresh exertions for sustaining and extending the missionary efforts of the Church both at home and abroad." The discussions were free, but were conducted in an admirable spirit, and the following measures were finally recommended:

1. First, that Home Missionary Associations be organized in the different Dio-

cesses under the Bishop, the Archdeacons, and such Clergy and Laity as may be brought to consult with them concerning the spiritual wants of the Diocese, and the best mode of relieving them.

2. That Clergymen be sought out who possess special gifts for influencing those who are now unhappily estranged from all religious ordinances; and that such Clergy, under due Ecclesiastical authority, should minister in temporary buildings till, under God's blessing, they have gathered a flock which may be collected in a Church.

3. That when the Parish Church does not afford sufficient accommodation at the ordinary services, additional services shall be added, at which the whole Church should be open to the poor. For the conduct of these services the Parochial Clergymen may, if he desire it, call on the assistance of the before-mentioned Missionary Clergymen.

4. That the Deans and Canons of the different Cathedrals should take into their consideration what facilities they possess for assembling in their Cathedrals the laboring population of their respective cities for short services, with congregational singing, and sermons from Preachers who may be peculiarly qualified to address such congregations, without limiting the choice to their own body.

5. That the Clergy more frequently than at present do substitute for set elaborate sermons, catechetical lectures and plain expositions of the Word of God, marked especially by addresses to the conscience which may be easily understood by the least instructed member of their congregations.

6. That the services of our Church and the celebration of Holy Communion be increased in number in those Parishes in which they are at present infrequent, and that the Clergy and Laity meet oftener for friendly consultation concerning the advancement of the Kingdom of Christ, with prayer for God's blessing on their labors.

The Bishop of Oxford presented the following Petition:

To the Most Rev. the Archbishop, the Right Rev. the Bishops, and the Rev. the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned Clergy of the Province of Canterbury,

Showeth—That while your petitioners thankfully acknowledge the great increase of zeal and activity which has of late been shown throughout the Church of England, they have yet to lament that her full energies are greatly hampered by the want of an Episcopate at all adequate to the present needs of the Church.

That whereas the population has increased during the last three hundred years, from about four millions to nearly twenty millions; and whereas the present number of the clergy is about eighteen thousand, and it is calculated that they are increasing at the rate of three hundred a year, the number of Bishops has remained the same, with the addition of *one only*.

That your petitioners, judging from the happy results which have attended the extension of the Episcopate in the colonies, confidently anticipate similar advantages from the extension of the Episcopate at home, because they feel that the opportunity of more frequent personal intercourse between a Bishop and the clergy and laity of his diocese would tend to infuse new life and vigor into the Church, and promote unity, consistency, and efficiency in the labors of those who are working for the salvation of souls.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your venerable body will devote its earnest attention to this important subject, and exert its best endeavors to procure the speedy carrying out of the recommendation contained in the Third Report of the Cathedral Commission, that a permissive bill (similar to the Act 31 Henry VIII, c. 9) should be framed and introduced into Parliament, empowering her Majesty and her Majesty's successors to divide any diocese, under certain conditions of territory and population, and with the consent of the Bishop, where it is proposed to effect the division before the avoidance of the See.

And your petitioners will ever pray.

The Bishop of London presented the following Petition from a large number of the Clergy and Laity of the Church of England, on the "coöperation of the Clergy and Laity."

To the Most Rev. the Archbishop, the Right Rev. the Bishops, and the Rev. the Clergy of the Province of Canterbury, in Convocation assembled.

The humble petition of the undersigned Clergy and Laity of the Church of England,

Showeth—That your petitioners observe with thankfulness the progress which continues to be made towards the restoration of Synodal action in the Church of England.

That your petitioners have seen with satisfaction the appointment of a committee of the Lower House in May, 1857, to consider the best means of securing the united counsel and coöperation of the clergy and laity of the Church.

That your petitioners appreciate highly the benefits derivable from ruridecanal Synods and Chapters.

That your petitioners believe that ruridecanal divisions of dioceses would likewise afford convenient facilities for lay coöperation, if laymen resident within the deanery were invited by the Rural Dean, as occasion might require, to confer with the clergy on subjects affecting the welfare and usefulness of the Church.

Your petitioners, therefore, humbly pray that your venerable House will be pleased to take into consideration the possibility and desirableness of making some provision for the more thorough revival of ruridecanal Synods or Chapters throughout the province.

Your petitioners further pray that you will take steps for the promotion of such a measure of coöperation of clergy and laity in ruridecanal divisions or dioceses, as in your wisdom you may deem right and expedient.

And sincerely trusting that the blessing and guidance of the Holy Spirit may be vouchsafed to your deliberations, your petitioners, as in duty bound, will ever pray.

On this most important matter, the Bishop of Oxford said: "Clearly it is the only way open to us, because it is impossible for us by any means to bring the laity into the Convocation of the province. That would alter entirely the fundamental constitution of Convocation, which consists of Bishops and clergy, and of them exclusively. We all desire, as my Right Rev. brother (the Bishop of London) says, to bring the laity and the clergy into consultation with each other. We have none of us any idea of dictating to the laity, of lording it over them or their faith. But we earnestly wish to see them working with us in consultation upon the common matters of the Church, and giving us the great benefit of their advice and coöperation. I heartily concur and sympathize in the prayer of the petition."

And the Archbishop, alluding to some recent instances of the introduction of Laity into Church Synods, said: "The clergy themselves have invited certain of the laity to form the lay part of that Synod. They have already met twice. They have considered two or three subjects which are very important to the Church, and their meetings have been not only exceedingly harmonious and cordial, but promise to be very useful. Certainly the machinery is not very difficult where there are a sufficient number of persons to afford a selection, and with the assistance of the Archdeacon and the Rural Dean, I do not think your lordships would find any difficulty in organizing such Synods."

We have given only a record of the results actually reached in the House of Bishops; and these, as it will be seen, reach matters of the most vital importance to the Church itself.

LOWER HOUSE.

In attendance upon the Lower House, there were the Dean of Norwich, Archdeacons Denison, Thorp, Harrison, and Hone; the Archdeacons of Lewes, Berks, Huntingdon, Barnstaple, Stafford, Rochester, Hereford, and Sarum; Chancellor Martin; the Proctors of the Chapters of Winchester, Chichester, Ely, Exeter, Lichfield, Christ Church, Oxford, Salisbury, Rochester, and St. Asaph. Amongst the representatives of the clergy, were the Rev. Messrs. Chester, Oxenden, Randolph, James Vincent, Best, Charles Williams, Ommaney, F. Vincent, Sir H.

Thompson, Acland, Brown, Claughton, Jebb, Burton, Massingberd, Majendie, Harding, Mills, Loyd, Hopper, Lowther, Seymour, Canon Woodgate, &c.

The discussions in the Lower House seem to us to have been conducted with less regularity, dignity, and courtesy. The London *Guardian* well says: "the most remarkable passages arise from the sudden irruptions of Archdeacon Denison into the course of the debates, which are generally attended with some little disturbance." Our report of the doings of the House of Bishops is so full, that we can only say in brief, that in the Lower House petitions were presented complaining of attempts to interfere with the Prayer Book. A Report on Missions was presented by a committee. It spoke of the lowered standard of morality in the ordinary transactions of life, of prevalent indifference to religion and the spread of infidel opinions, as calling for increased exertion on the part of the Church. The Report recommended an increase of the number of Bishops, and the House ultimately expressed an opinion favorable to the appointment of coadjutor Bishops, and to granting facilities to Bishops wishing to retire from incapacity.

Convocation having been in session for business three days, on Friday, Feb. 13th, was prorogued until the 20th of August next.

ENGLISH CHURCH MISSIONS.

We have before us the Reports of the two great Missionary Societies of the English Church, from which we glean the following facts and statistics:

SOCIETY FOR THE PROPAGATION OF THE GOSPEL IN FOREIGN PARTS.—The annual report of this society has just been published. It states that for the last year the account stands as follows:—Collections, subscriptions, and donations, £54,548; Legacies, £11,117; dividends, annuities, &c., £3,910: total of society's general fund, £69,575. In addition to this, there was received: Contributions for particular dioceses, £16,658; for the Memorial Church at Constantinople, £18,237; making a grand total of £104,470. No part of the money raised in India, or in any part of the colonial dioceses, (a fund which is every year increasing, and which in the aggregate will, ere long, exceed that which is paid to the treasurers of the society in England,) is included in the preceding summary. The following is a summary of the society's present operations. There are in Nova Scotia 46 missionaries; in Fredericton, 42; in Quebec, 23; in Montreal, 34; in Toronto, 100; in Rupert's Land, 2; in Newfoundland, 34; in Jamaica, 12; in Antigua, 1; in Barbadoes, 5; in Guiana, 11; in Cape Town, 12; in Graham's Town, 10; in Natal, 5; in Mauritius, 1; in Calcutta, 16; in Madras, 38; in Colombo, 14; in Labuan, 7; in Sydney, 12; in Newcastle, 8; in Melbourne, 14; in Adelaide, 7; in Perth, 1; in Tasmania, 1; and in New Zealand, 10. The total number of missionaries maintained in whole or in part by the society is 466. In addition to the above list of clergy, the number of divinity students, catechists, schoolmasters, and others, maintained by the society, is above 700.

THE CHURCH MISSIONARY SOCIETY FOR AFRICA AND THE EAST.—This society is in advance of the elder association in its funds. "The Committee report, with devout thankfulness to God, that the income raised during the past year (1856) in this country (exclusive of the sums raised and expended in the *Missions*) has exceeded that of any former year. It amounts to £123,174, exhibiting an increase of over £1,000 in addition to the special contributions to cover the deficiency of last year." The number of Missionary Clergy connected with this Society is set down as 172 European and 46 native; the number of catechists, teachers, &c., European, 50; native, 1868.

The total amount thus raised by these Societies of the Church of England for Missionary purposes, in 1856, amounted to the sum of £227,644, or about \$1,138,220, and to this should be added the large contributions of the *Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, and the Colonial Bishops' Fund*.

The present condition of India and the demand for more vigorous missionary operations are engaging the attention of both these two Societies. The positive Church tone of the Venerable Propagation Society has enlisted a strenuous opposition to prevent that Society from improving popular sympathy to prosecute her work as a Church Institution. The Bishop of Madras has lately borne witness to the conservative influence on the natives in his Diocese of the Gospel. Where the Gospel had been most plainly taught there had been most fidelity to the English Government. And to show how treacherous to the Gospel that Government has been we may record that at a meeting on India of the *Church Missionary Society*, on January 11, the Rev. Mr. Reuther, a Missionary, who had escaped from Jaunpore, said that he had been 15 years in India, but never had been once within a Sepoy barracks—not because he was unwilling to preach to the Sepoys, but because he was not permitted to do so, it being quite understood that the Government was anxious to keep the army free from Missionary influence.

The Church Missionary Society recently held its regular meeting at Exeter Hall, for the promotion of missions to India. The Archbishop of Canterbury occupied the chair, supported by the Bishops of London, Winchester, and Norwich; Bishop Carr, the Earl of Chichester, Hon. A. Kinnaird, Mr. J. C. Colquhoun, Dr. Miller, of Birmingham; Mr. Thomas, late Member of Council at Madras, and others. The venerable Primate said, The Hindoo, whose religion is bigotry, and the Mahometan, who propagates his religion by fire and by the sword, will be slow to understand that we should not desire the conversion of India if it can only be accomplished by force and compulsion. But what we do desire, and what the country demands, is that our religion should have fair play. (Applause.) Whatever may be the future government of India—though we do not evoke its power—we desire its countenance. We require that Christianity shall be acknowledged by the Government—that our missions shall be encouraged, not frowned upon. (Applause.) There is a wide difference between a man's professing himself a Christian, and his compelling others to embrace the Christian faith. There is a wide distinction between entering upon a crusade against the believers of Mahomet or the devotees of Vishnu, and leaving those heathen to suppose that so far as depends on their Christian rulers it is a matter of no consequence whether or no they turn from their vanities to serve the only true and living God. (Applause.)

The Rev. H. Venn read a report to the meeting, which spoke highly of the bearing of the native Christians, and recorded some instances where they had suffered death for conscience' sake. The Rev. C. Reuther, a missionary from Jounpore, spoke to the same effect. Mr. Kinnaird said that God had blessed missionary labor in Central India, and mentioned that there are 100,000 native Christians in Burmah.

SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING CHRISTIAN KNOWLEDGE.—This noble Institution still goes on in its quiet course, doing its invaluable work publishing and distributing Bibles, Prayer Books, Books and Tracts. Its entire income for the last year was £34,600, or about \$183,000. Since 1783, when the Society began to publish accounts of its issues, it has circulated more than one hundred and twenty-six millions, five hundred thousand Books and Tracts.

The following is a short statement of the proceedings of the Foreign Translation Committee since its appointment in the year 1834:—

The Committee have issued translations of the Bible in French, Italian, Dutch, German, and Spanish. The printing of the Arabic Bible has just been completed. The New Testament has been published in Maltese, Polish, Arabic, and Ojibwa. The Psalter in Arabic, and Triglot Psalters in French, English, and German, and in Italian, English, and Spanish, have been for some time in circulation; and a Greek Psalter from the Septuagint, has recently been added to the Catalogue. The Gospel according to St. Matthew in the language of New Zealand, and the Gospels and Acts, with part of the Book of Genesis, in the lan-

guage of the Arawak Indians, have been published. A translation of the Acts of the Apostles, in the language of the Zulu Kafirs, has been printed, at the request of the Bishop of Natal. The New Testament in Coptic and Arabic has been published. The Prayer Book has been produced in French, Dutch, German, Danish, Italian, Spanish, Portuguese, Modern Greek, Modern Armenian, Maltese, Arabic, Turkish, Amharic, New Zealand, Ojibwa, Muncey, and Cree, (North American Indian.)

LONDON MISSIONARY SOCIETY.—The *London Missionary Society* announces its total receipts for ordinary purposes in 1856 to have been £66,277, including foreign contributions. "The Special Fund for the relief of Widows and Orphans, and disabled Missionaries, amounts to £2,202." "The present number of the Society's European and ordained Missionaries is 152; the number of its native agents, including evangelists, catechists, scripture readers, schoolmasters and mistresses, is about 700." Our readers are probably aware that a "fundamental principle" of this Society is "that its design is not to send Presbyterianism, Independency, Episcopacy, or any other form of Church Order and Government, but the glorious Gospel of the blessed God, to the heathen, leaving it to the minds of those whom He may call into the fellowship of his Son from among them, to assume for themselves such form of Church Government as to them shall appear most agreeable to the word of God." Of course this Society acts upon the principle that there is no form of Church Order, which can claim Scriptural or Apostolic authority; and that converted Africans, and Chinese, must be left to have one form, or another, or none at all, as they please. The keen-eyed Brahmin sees the weakness of this principle and urges it. He says, "you come to me with a religion which you claim is positive, and authoritative, and of divine obligation. Settle among yourselves what that Religion is, in its Doctrines and Institutions, if it has any; and then come and tell me."

MISSIONS OF THE UNITED BRETHREN.—From the Report of the London Association in aid of the *Missions of the United Brethren, commonly called Moravians*, we learn that their income for 1855, amounted to £13,564, of which £5,583 were contributed by "Friends of other Christian denominations on the Continent, in Great Britain and Ireland, and in North America." With these limited means, they are able to maintain an aggregate of seventy Stations, and some three hundred Missionary brethren and sisters in various parts of the world.

GENERAL RESULTS.

The *London Colonial Church Chronicle*, in summing up the results of the various Missionary Societies in England, says, "these statistics show that the sums raised in aid of Missions by the different dissenting bodies, amount to £222,600, while, as we have seen, the Church of England contributes through her two great Missionary organs, £227,644. We have remarked, indeed, that this does not indicate the whole amount raised by the Church of England for Missionary objects, for the *Christian Knowledge Society* devotes yearly a large portion of its income to the furtherance of these purposes; and in comparing the totals, we must remember that our Societies do not report the sums raised in foreign parts, while the Dissenters' associations do; but, even so, considering the great wealth possessed by members of our Communion, and the immense vantage ground which it has from its endowments, this comparison of our respective efforts to carry what we hold to be "the Truth," to the perishing heathen, can hardly fail to fill Churchmen with shame for past short-comings, and to spur them to more earnest exertion for the future."

SPECIAL SERVICES IN ENGLISH CHURCHES FOR THE WORKING CLASSES.

It is one of the signs of the times, that several of the largest London Churches have lately been opened for special Services for the working classes.

Beginning with Westminster Abbey, the first sermon, on the 3d of January, was preached by the Dean of Westminster; the second, on the 10th, by the Sub-Dean; the third, on the 17th, by the Bishop of Oxford; the fourth, on the 24th, by the Dean of Canterbury; and the 5th, on the 31st, by the Rev. C. J. P. Eyre.

Arrangements were also made for holding special services for the working classes in the Churches of St. Pancras, St. Giles-in-the-Fields, St. Mary, Whitechapel, and St. Barnabas, Kensington, during each week-day evening (except Saturday) of the first week of the new year. The following were the preachers: *St. Pancras*. Monday, the Very Rev. Dr. Trench, Dean of Westminster; Tuesday, the Bishop of Oxford; Wednesday, the Rev. A. Boyd, M. A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Cheltenham; Thursday, the Rev. Dr. Hook, vicar of Leeds; Friday, the Rev. J. Riddell. *St. Giles-in-the-Fields*. Monday, the Rev. Daniel Moore, M. A., Incumbent of Camden Church, Camberwell; Tuesday, the Rev. Capel Molyneux, M. A., Minister of Lock Hospital; Wednesday, the Dean of Westminster; Thursday, the Rev. A. Maclean, M. A., Master of Bath Grammar School; Friday, the Rev. J. Hampden Gurney, Rector of St. Mary's, Bryanston-square. *St. Mary, Whitechapel*. Monday, the Rev. William Cadman, M. A., Rector of St. George's, Southwark; Tuesday, the Rev. C. J. P. Eyre, M. A., Rector of St. Marylebone; Wednesday, the Rev. Dr. Hook, Vicar of Leeds; Thursday, the Rev. Henry Melvill, B. D., Canon Residentiary of St. Paul's; Friday, the Rev. Dr. Goulburn, Minister of Quebec Chapel, late Master of Rugby. *St. Barnabas, Kensington*. Monday, the Bishop of London; Tuesday, the Rev. J. Riddell, M. A.; Wednesday, the Bishop of Oxford; Thursday, the Rev. Alexander Boyd, M. A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Cheltenham; Friday, the Rev. A. Maclean, Master of Bath School. The incumbents of the three Churches first mentioned belong to the so-called Evangelical or Low Church party. It will be noticed, however, that they have not thought it ill to associate to themselves eminent men of higher ecclesiastical opinions than their own, in a work to which the Church should lend its united energies.

At St. Pancras Church, a large congregation of working people attended, and the Bishop of Oxford, after speaking in a strain of persuasive earnestness which those who have ever heard the Bishop will fully understand, his Lordship said, that this was the message he had to deliver to them, and he besought them not to turn away from it. If they attended to it, life might be to them the sunshine of God's presence, and death might be to them the entrance to his glory. The sermon, although marked with the greatest simplicity of diction, and abounding with the most familiar illustrations, was a most brilliant piece of pulpit oratory. The congregation were literally entranced, and the Bishop, feeling the importance of the occasion, and realizing probably the fact that some of those he was addressing might never again appear within the walls of a church, was frequently overcome with an emotion which he attempted unsuccessfully to check.

This new effort to diffuse the power of the Gospel among the people has however developed one characteristic feature of the self-styled "Evangelicals" so plainly, that it deserves to be recorded. The Vicar of Leeds, the Rev. Dr. Hook, one of the most faithful, zealous and successful of all the English Clergy, was the preacher on one occasion. But, alas! Dr. Hook is regarded as a High Churchman! and so, as the vast congregation retired from the Church, they were presented with printed handbills, got up by the "Evangelicals," inciting them against the preacher, and containing such language as this, "Have you heard the Gospel?" &c., &c. And the (London) *Record*, of January 4th, has the following: "I can understand our Evangelical brethren combining with orthodox Dissenters, but not with those whose teaching on the most precious truths of the Gospel is so radically unsound. There is too much tendency, I fear, just now, to mix up Church Missionary Society principles with those of the Propagation Society, merely to secure more outward uniformity. This must always be at the expense of real unity. I am jealous of Jehoshaphat making an unholy alliance with Ahab, Whitechapel with Leeds, Oxford with Marylebone,

the same pulpit using two trumpets, the same fountain sending forth both sweet water and bitter."

And again: "Surely plenty of talented Evangelical clergymen could be found, without sending all the way to Leeds for Dr. Hook to come up and preach in a Whitechapel pulpit to the working classes, his well-known anti-Evangelical sentiments."

The whole effort, however, has been eminently successful. The Services have been attended throughout by vast crowds. At Westminster Abbey, 4,000 persons were present, and as many more left for want of room. The reports of the Sermons which we have seen, show that the Truth was most plainly and powerfully presented. Hitherto the Church in England and the Colonies, has been guilty of a great practical mistake. Hedged in by a cold, frowning "respectability," she has driven the people to seek sympathy and instruction amid the broken but numerous ranks of Dissent. And it is a joyful and pleasant thing, to see men like the Bishop of Oxford and Dr. Hook, on the one hand, and the Rev. Mr. Eyre and Mr. Cadman on the other, thus uniting together in a common work for a common and such a glorious end.

STATISTICS OF THE CHURCH IN SCOTLAND FOR 1851-1858.

The *Scottish Ecclesiastical Journal* has some tables of statistics of the Scotch Church, from which we take the following:

DIOCESSES.	Total Clergy, 1851.	Total Clergy, 1858.	Total Churches and Chapels, 1851.	Total Churches and Chapels, 1858.	Consecrated Churches, 1851.	Consecrated Churches, 1858.	Churches hav- ing Daily Ser- vice, 1851.	Churches hav- ing Daily Ser- vice, 1858.	Schools, 1851.	Schools, 1858.	Parsonages, 1851.	Parsonages, 1858.
Edinburgh, . . .	92	30	15	23	11	12	3	4	9	15	3	5
Argyll and the Isles, . .	9	14	13	17	4	6	1	1	6	8	5	5
Brechin, . . .	16	17	18	16	4	5	5	6	13	20	7	7
Glasgow and Galloway, . .	24	38	25	37	11	21	6	4	18	19	2	5
Moray and Ross, . . .	10	17	12	20	5	8	2	4	3	7	2	4
St. Andrews, Dunkeld, and Dunblane, . . .	22	27	22	25	7	13	4	6	7	12	3	7
Aberdeen, . . .	24	27	23	25	11	17	9	9	7	19	14	18
Trin. Coll., Glenalmond, (Extra Diocesan,) . . .	3	4	1	1	1	1	1	1			2	2
Totals, . . .	130	174	127	164	54	88	31	35	53	103	38	53
Increase, . . .		44		37		29		4	45			15

From this, it appears that the number of the Clergy in 1851, was only about three-fourths of their number in 1858; and the increase in the number of Churches, Schools, and Parsonage Houses, was equally large. A considerable amount has been contributed, meanwhile, to Trinity College, Glenalmond, to the *Regium Donum* Fund, the College at Cumbræ, the Cathedral at Perth, and to St. Andrew's Hall. The number of Confirmations is surprisingly small. Thus, in the year 1857, there were confirmed in the Diocese of Edinburgh, 160 persons; in the Diocese of Argyll, 7; in the Diocese of Glasgow, 117; in the Diocese of Moray, 34; in the Diocese of St. Andrews, 133; in the Diocese of Aberdeen, 174; and at Trinity College, Glenalmond, 9; making a total of 634.

SCOTLAND.

DOCTRINE OF THE HOLY EUCHARIST—IMPORTANT TESTIMONY.

We are happy to give the following very important Document. The views which have been sometimes *attributed* to the Scottish Bishops, on the Holy Eucharist, differ very little from those of the Romish Church; nor do we hesitate to say that we have recently seen a theory propounded in this country on

the Eucharist so extravagant and unguarded in statement, that the *Minister* and the *Communion* are almost wholly lost in the *Priest* and the *Sacrifice*; a theory, which, if true, candles and incense, bowings and prostrations, yea, and a good many more things, besides, are sure to follow. In other words, *reverence* degenerates into *superstition*; the *Sacrament* becomes the *very thing* of which it is only the *Sign* and the *Seal*, Christ is shut out from the view of the penitent; and the Church becomes a *Fountain*, instead of the *Medium* and *Channel*, of Grace. And hence it is, that many, who do not reason closely on these subjects, or who see the popular tendency to abuse and misconstruction, object to the use of the terms Priest, Altar, and Sacrifice, altogether. Certain it is, that no person holding the views which the Bishops of Scotland protest against, can be otherwise than both very uneasy and very troublesome, while they remain among us. These are not the views of Holy Scripture; nor of the Primitive Church; nor of our own. So we said, in the case of ex-Bishop Ives, and of Wilberforce, long before they left us. In the following reprint, we follow the original in capitals, italics, &c.:

At its meeting in Edinburgh, on the 11th of December, a motion was made that a Declaration on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist should be issued by the Episcopal Synod. A Declaration such as would appear to have been contemplated in the motion which the Synod did not adopt, was subsequently signed by three of the seven Bishops. We proceed to lay this paper before our readers, together with a document which its circulation has called forth, viz. An Address to the Bishop of Edinburgh by the Dean and nineteen other Presbyters of his Diocese.

I. DECLARATION on the Doctrine of the Holy Eucharist, signed by the Bishops of Edinburgh, Argyll and the Isles, and Glasgow and Galloway.

Whereas the minds of many devout Christians have been injuriously affected by recent statements on the subject of the SACRAMENT OF THE LORD'S SUPPER, wherein the doctrine propounded respecting the Oblation of the Bread and Wine, and also respecting the reverence due to the consecrated Elements, and asserted to be the doctrine of the Church of England, and also of the Scottish Episcopal Church, appears opposed to the teaching of both Churches:

We, the undersigned Bishops of the said Scottish Episcopal Church, do hereby declare, as follows:

1. We hold and teach that the Body and Blood of Christ are not so present in the consecrated Elements of Bread and Wine as to be therein the proper object of such supreme Adoration as is due to God alone.

2. We consider such Adoration to be repudiated by the Declaration at the end of the English Communion Office; and we hold the reasons why kneeling at the reception of the consecrated Bread and Wine was enjoined, to be the reasons there assigned for the injunction, and no other.

3. Whereas attempts have been made to show that there is no substantial difference between the Sacrifice of the Cross and the Sacrifice of the Altar, and that the ancient Doctors maintain this view—We believe that thus a variance has been erroneously implied between the Doctrine of the Ancient Doctors, and the Doctrine of the Church to which we belong. For the Eucharistic Sacrifice, if substantially the same with the Sacrifice of the Cross, would be "an offering of Christ for the quick and dead to have remission of pain or guilt;" and such view of the Eucharist is expressly condemned by the 31st Article of Religion.

4. We cannot understand the doctrine thus erroneously ascribed to the ancient Fathers in any other sense than as affirming that the Eucharist is either a *continuation* or a *repetition* of the Sacrifice which was *once for all* offered upon the Cross. Both these views we hold to be in direct opposition to the argument of St. Paul in the 10th Chapter of his Epistle to the Hebrews;—to the Prayer of Consecration in the Scotch Communion Office, which describes the Eucharist as "a perpetual memorial of that His precious Death and Sacrifice;—and to the Prayer for the whole state of Christ's Church in the same

Office, which describes the Eucharist as "the Commemoration of the most precious Death and Passion of our Saviour Christ."

5. While we deny the propositions above alluded to, we steadfastly hold and teach with the Catechism, "That the Body and Blood of Christ are verily and indeed taken and received by the faithful in the Lord's Supper;" and with the first part of the Homily on the Sacrament, "That in the Supper of the Lord there is no vain ceremony, no bare sign, no untrue figure of a thing absent; but as the Scripture saith, the Table of the Lord, the Bread and Cup of the Lord, the memory of Christ, yea, the Communion of the Body and Blood of the Lord, in a marvelous incorporation, which, by the operation of the Holy Ghost, the very bond of our conjunction with Christ, is *through Faith*, wrought in the souls of the *faithful*, whereby not only their souls live to eternal life, but they surely trust to win for their bodies a joyful resurrection to immortality."

C. H. TERROR, Bishop of Edinburgh.

ALEX. EWING, Bishop of Argyll and the Isles.

W. J. TROWER, Bishop of Glasgow and Galloway.

II. ADDRESS to the Bishop of Edinburgh by the Dean and nineteen other Presbyters of the Diocese.

To the Right Reverend the Bishop of Edinburgh, and Primus :

RIGHT REVEREND SIR:—We, the Dean and Clergy of the Diocese of Edinburgh, are desirous of offering to your Reverence our respectful and grateful acknowledgments of the Declaration on the question of the Holy Eucharist, signed by yourself and the Bishops of Argyll and Glasgow, which we have just received. We now beg to express our deep and sincere conviction that this statement supplies an admirable and effective Protest against certain recent and dangerous doctrinal views which threaten to disturb the peace of our Church, and to invade the purity of her teaching on the subject of the Eucharist. We have considered it to be our duty to signify in this manner our full concurrence with the statements which you have laid before us, and, as we think, most opportunely for our Church. And we are, Right Reverend Sir, with much respect, your dutiful Presbyters,

E. B. RAMSAY, Dean; V. Grantham Faithful; John Alexander, St. Columba's; A. E. Watson, Incumbent of St. George's; Edward Sterling Murphy, St. James'; James McLachlan, Incumbent of St. Paul's, C. C.; Charles R. Teape, St. Andrew's; J. Ogilvy Millar, St. John's; H. H. Franklin; Robert Henderson, Minister, Episcopal Church, Stirling; Walter M. Goalen, A. M., Incumbent of Christ's Church, Trinity; Thomas Langhorne, Jr., Assistant Minister of Episcopal Church, Musselburgh; Charles S. Absolom, Incumbent of St. Mark's, Portobello; T. N. Wannop, Incumbent of Trinity Church, Haddington; Thomas N. Hamilton; Augustus E. Crowder, L. T. Durham, Incumbent of Christ's Church, Dunse; Charles Hinxman, B. A., Baliol College, Oxon, Incumbent of St. Andrew's, Dunmore; E. B. Field, Domestic Chaplain to the Earl of Rosebery; Henry G. W. Aubrey, Incumbent of St. Mary's, Dalmahoy; T. J. Burlton, Military Chapel, Greenlaw.

ENGLAND.

THE NEW MINISTRY.

On Friday, Feb. 19, the Palmerston ministry having been defeated in the House of Commons on the "Conspiracy to Murder" Bill, which was intended to reach conspiracies of refugees against foreign governments and individuals, the Cabinet at once resigned. The new Ministry is as follows:

First Lord of the Treasury, Earl of Derby; Chancellor of the Exchequer, Right Hon. Benjamin Disraeli; Lord Chancellor, Sir Frederic Thesiger; President of the Council, Marquis of Salisbury; Lord Privy Seal, Lord Hardwicke.

SECRETARIES OF STATE.—The Home Department, Right Hon. Spencer H. Walpole; the Foreign Department, Earl of Malmesbury; the Colonial Department, Lord Stanley of Alderley; the War Department, Gen. Peel; First Lord of the

Admiralty, Right Hon. Sir John Pakington; Postmaster General, Lord Colchester; President of the Board of Trade, Right Hon. J. W. Henley; President of the Board of Control, Earl of Ellenborough; First Commissioner of Public Works, Right Hon. Lord John Manners; Attorney General, Sir Fitzroy Kelly; Under Secretary for War, Major A. H. P. Stuart Wortley.

IRELAND.—Lord Lieutenant, Earl of Eglinton; Lord Chancellor, Right Hon. F. Blackburne; Chief Secretary, Lord Naas.

The Duke of Newcastle, Lord Grey, and Mr. Gladstone, to whom overtures were made by Lord Derby, declined to join his Cabinet.

OXFORD SPIRITUAL AID SOCIETY.

On Tuesday, June 2d, a large and influential meeting was held in Oxford, for the purpose of inaugurating a new society, the main object of which will be to afford permanent or temporary pecuniary aid to the most necessitous clergy of the diocese towards the maintenance of curates. The Bishop of Oxford presided and made the opening speech, in which were the following statements:

"In these parishes, therefore, the Church is neglecting its duty; it is not discharging what it undertook to discharge,—the supplying, through the means of the clergy, the spiritual necessities of the people. In the first class of cases I find there are eighty-six parishes with eighty-eight churches, the aggregate population being 47,000, the endowment in each parish being under £100 a year; and if you take the average income of these eighty-six parishes, it amounts to only £72, 10s. to each incumbent." * * *

"We have another class of parishes with endowments under £150 a year. We have seventy-one such containing eighty-seven churches, with an aggregate population of 72,000; the average income for the incumbents of these parishes being £133, 10s.; or, taking these two classes together, we have 157 parishes, with 175 churches, and a total population of 120,000—the average incomes of the incumbents being under £100 a year." * * *

"Among the cases I have collected in these returns are such as these, but which I have not mentioned because I wished rather to place the matter before you in its breadth. There is Colnbrook, with 1,400 population, and the endowment is a house and four acres of land. Then there is Sandford, with a population of 341, and an endowment of £15 a year; and Hazlemere, with its 1,160 souls, scattered through the backwoods of Berkshire, with an endowment of £43 a year. There is another large parish with a population of 1,261, and an endowment of £56 a year, and another very near here, (East Baldon,) which illustrates a different class of cases; for there are 272 souls scattered over a large rural district, with an endowment of £30 a year. There are many others, which, however, I will not weary you with mentioning. There is Woodstock, a chapelry of the little parish of Bladen, with 1,400 people, and £12 a year and a house for the endowment."

These facts given by the Bishop of Oxford, are suggestive. There are *eighty-eight* churches where the average salary is only about \$360 a year. Then, there are *eighty-seven* Churches, where the average income is less than \$500 per annum. And then there are a number of parishes with a large population, where the income varies from \$75 to \$260 per year.

The Hon. Mr. Gladstone, M. P., made a noble speech, in which he bore witness to the revival of power and life in the English Church. He said, "under whatever circumstances of difficulty, of want, of privation, ay, even of danger, men always answer to the call, and the same spirit which in earlier times has prompted them to abandon everything for the sake of their Saviour has been remarkably revived among ourselves, and every day furnishes instances of those who count none of the blessings of this life dear to them, provided they may be chosen to the honor of preaching the unsearchable riches of Christ."

He also uttered the following truly Christian sentiment, "yet I confess that sometimes, not the measures that have been taken, but the language that is used, excites some feeling of jealousy and misgiving in my mind, for the extension of

popular education is recommended in such a way as to give us to understand that a certain mechanical process of multiplying schools and schoolmasters would cure the whole moral disease of the community. If such expectations are entertained I believe they will be sorely disappointed. The schoolmaster is an essential agent in the work of public improvement. But the schoolmaster, however useful, is after all a human invention, and a secondary instrument, whose business it is to supply, in the first place, the deficiencies resulting from the incapacity or the necessities of the parents, and, in the second place, to supply the complement to the ministrations of the Church. But it will be a bad day for England in which we forget the functions of the Christian minister, to whom the work of assisting human souls has been intrusted by the Lord, and if we carry over the work, or profess to carry it over, to the hands of the schoolmaster, even although we cover the transaction by saying that we will have none other than a religious education."

CUDDESDON COLLEGE—DIOCESE OF OXFORD.

The readers of the *Church Review* will recollect the high tribute paid to this Theological College in a recent article. A Rev. Mr. Golightly, however, has lately made a severe attack upon this College, charging that its teaching tends "to sow broadcast the seeds of Romish perversion," &c.; and that the altar, the service-book, the ritual, and the genuflections, &c., are Romish. The Bishop of Oxford has met the charge promptly, and the Report of the Commissioners, appointed to examine into the affairs of the College, has been published. It is difficult to speak calmly of the conduct of Mr. Golightly in this matter. Besides the vindication of the College by these Commissioners, forty-seven out of the whole fifty-four past and present students sign their names to a document which emphatically declares that they owe no greater debt of gratitude to their instructors than for the assistance they gave them towards the discernment of Roman errors. The various incumbents again from different dioceses who have employed these much maligned persons, "representing very different shades of theological opinions," speak almost to a man in precisely the same strain. If there is one thing for which they are thankful to have obtained their services more than another, it is for their firm and wise attachment to the Church of England.

BISHOP OF OXFORD ON POPERY.

The Rt. Rev. the Lord Bishop of Oxford, in his Sermon before the University on the "New Dogma," closes with the following bold and unambiguous language: "Let us take the caution. We have faults, evils, deficiencies, God knows, amongst ourselves; we feel them, perhaps groan under them; and she, veiling from us the grossness of her own evils, invites us with honeyed words of seeming sympathy to fly from them to her. But see in this one instance what is the truth in all. See from the first where you must end, and remember that no preference for certain things in her communion can ever justify your accepting in any the least particular, what you know to be falsehood, as the truth of God. And yet this they must do who take her as their guide. They must come to bear with her trifling with the truth; with her undervaluing of God's word; with her portentous system of priestcraft, whereby first the sacred and inalienable responsibility of conscience is invaded, and then its purity corrupted, and in many instances its very life extinguished; they must endure her substitution of another mediator for the co-eternal Son, the Virgin-born; they must receive her new-coined dogmas and her spurious articles of faith. See then, all this from the beginning; and when she comes to you with her fairest promises, with all her grossness veiled from you, and she herself transformed into an angel of light, to work your downfall, then to disenchant your beguiled senses, read and weigh the warning graven by the finger of God upon her forehead, and upon that of every other carnal perverter of the Church's purity, *Mystery, Babylon the Great, the Mother of Harlots and Abominations of the Earth!*"

THE PITCAIRNERS IN NORFOLK ISLAND.

Our readers are doubtless familiar with the story of the Pitcairners; the mutineers of the *Bounty*; the patriarchal position of the sole survivor, John Adams; his teaching of the Bible and Prayer Book, and its effect on those simple people; of the labors of Mr. Hobbs, &c. In June, 1856, this entire people were transferred to Norfolk Island, numbering in all just about *two hundred* souls. The *Colonial Church Chronicle*, for January and February, gives a particular account of these people, and of their settlement at this former Convict Station, and of the Visitation of the Bishop of Sydney. The whole population, excepting those that were too young and three invalids, were Confirmed. The account would make, with some explanations, a beautiful little book for our Church Book Society.

REVIVAL OF SYNODS IN THE ENGLISH CHURCH.

Among the most encouraging news from the English Church, we learn that the "Society for the Revival of Convocation," is at present very active in getting signatures to petitions to both Houses in this Province, for steps being taken to promote the revival of Rurideaconal Synods and coöperation of clergy and laity therein. Mr. Henry Hoare, who is one of the most active members of the Society, has just issued a circular on the subject, in which he says:

"We feel that we can no longer limit our view in this matter to the Church at home—it is a world-wide range which presents itself to the mind of a man who considers the great Synodal question in its bearings on the destinies of the whole English Church. In fact, whether it be our own country, our colonies, or the vast Eastern Dependencies which look for Christianity at our hands, we recognize everywhere the need of the revival of the active, organizing powers of Convocation. I may refer to the varied matter contained in the Reports of the two Houses of Convocation, and more especially their suggestions as regards Home and Foreign Missions, to prove that all the pressing requirements of Religion at the present time, may be said to be summed up in one word—CONVOCA-TION."

REVIVAL OF THE SLAVE-TRADE IN FRANCE.

On Saturday, Dec. 12th, in the British Commons, the Earl of Clarendon was drawn out, and made some clear and definite statements of the present attempts to revive the Slave-trade on the part of the French. It appears that a French trading house at Marseilles, Messrs. Regis, entered into contract with certain *African Chiefs*, to supply, from time to time, a certain number of negroes at so much a head, who are placed on board French ships to be sent to French West India Colonies at Martinique and elsewhere. Certain formalities are however transacted with these negroes before starting, of the nature and import of which, of course, the negroes know nothing. These French contractors are authorized to offer the African Chiefs fifty dollars a head for negroes, and it is stated that the whole of the Yoruba country has been plunged into war to meet the demand for "free" emigrants! and negroes, peacefully engaged in their avocations, have been forcibly seized and carried off. It appears also, that the French Government has connived at this traffic; but, to save appearances, has sanctioned it on condition that it is to be a *bona fide* free emigration! How free, the above facts sufficiently show. It appears, also, that the British Government has remonstrated with the French Government against this infraction of the treaty of the Eight Powers for the suppression of the slave trade in 1815. And a collision was very near coming off on the African coast between an English man of war and two French ships which were taking in a cargo of negroes. But the French officer got off the negroes, and was congratulated by his government on his firmness. To the remonstrances of the English the French

Government replied, that they did not consider the present scheme any violation of that engagement. Here, thus far, the matter stands.

But there is a new phase to this movement. The British press, at least a portion of it, sympathize with this French experiment. The *London Times* confesses that the attempts to suppress the slave trade have been futile; and protests against going on, sacrificing English pith, toil, and money, in the attempt to "reduce other tropical colonies to the condition of our own." It virtually owns up, that the plan of British Emancipation has been socially, economically, and morally an utter failure. And so it unquestionably has.

If we understand this new French experiment, it is, to all intents and purposes, a revival of the slave trade, concealed under the flimsiest of guises; while the position of the negro, as a forced, paid, freeman, is far worse in reality, more helpless, and more dependent, than that which he occupies as a recognized slave in our own Southern States. The free negroes in tropical climes, by nature indolent, and able to subsist without labor on the spontaneous fruits of the earth, will not work except by compulsion; and every scheme which does not recognize this fact, has proved, and will prove abortive. Mr. Livingstone, in his late work affirms, however, that the efforts to suppress the slave trade have been successful to a very large extent. But as a matter of simple fact, all attempts to compete, by means of free labor, with Cuba and Brazil, and our Southern States, in the production of tropical commerce will prove a failure.


Since preparing the above from our English papers, we find the following in the *Washington Union* newspaper:

"By a private letter received in this city from Loango, coast of Africa, dated September 23, 1857, we are advised that the French have practically engaged in the slave trade under the name of *apprentices*, and that a ship, the *Clara*, of Bordeaux, was at Loango at the date mentioned above, loading with negroes for Martinique. A French war steamer lay along side to protect her from the English cruisers, who would have seized her but that she had a French naval officer on board with orders to the French Commodore to protect her. The English are also using negroes as slaves at Sierra Leone. The French and English Governments are participating in a trade which they affect to deem so hideous. A barracoon has been built by the French at Loango, to be used for the safe-keeping of the slaves until they are ready for shipment. There is no secret in this business, and no disguise is attempted."

We confess that the conduct of the British Government in India and China, has not given us a high opinion of its philanthropy.

ANOTHER ATTEMPTED ASSASSINATION OF LOUIS NAPOLEON.

Another attempt upon the life of the Emperor of France, was made on the evening of January 14th, at half-past nine o'clock, while he was entering the Italian Opera House, in the Rue Lepellier. Several bombs were projected which exploded with fearful effects, causing the death of six persons, and wounding nearly one hundred and fifty others. The Emperor and Empress escaped unharmed. The active guilty parties were mostly Italian refugees; and Count Orsini, Pierri, Gomez, Count Carlos de Rudio, and many others, have been arrested. Pierri is an ex Colonel in the Roman Republican army; and the plot appears to have been devised at Birmingham and Nottingham, those seats of English radicalism. It is reported that a formal demand has been made upon the British government for the expulsion of Victor Hugo, Mazzini, Ledru Rollin, and Louis Blanc from the British territory. At the trial of these men, the Court forthwith condemned Orsini, Pierri, and De Rudio to the punishment of parricides, and Gomez to *travaux forcés* for life. The crime of parricide is punished by being taken to the place of execution in shirt-sleeves, with naked feet, and the head covered with a black veil; the criminal is exposed on the scaffold while the sentence is being read to the assembled people, and then immediately beheaded.

 A large amount of Continental and Colonial Intelligence is omitted for want of room.